

THE WORLD CROQUET FEDERATION
LAWS OF ASSOCIATION CROQUET
7TH EDITION

OFFICIAL RULINGS AND COMMENTARY ON THE LAWS
produced by the World Croquet Federation's
Association Croquet Laws Committee

Date of publication of this document: April 2021

OFFICIAL RULINGS ON THE 7TH EDITION OF THE LAWS OF ASSOCIATION CROQUET

The Rulings that may from time to time be presented here constitute the Official Rulings on the Laws of Association Croquet (ORLAC) as described in Law 63.1.

Law 8.5.2 and the reference to it in Law 8.3 (April 2021)

The term "a ball" in the first sentence of Law 8.5.2 is to be interpreted as covering the *striker's ball* and, if the *stroke* is a *croquet stroke*, the ball from which the *striker* is *taking croquet*. It does not cover any other ball that the mallet could contact during the stroke. The clause in that same sentence "before the striker intended to strike the striker's ball" is to be interpreted as "before the final swing of the mallet towards the striker's ball".

COMMENTARY ON THE 7TH EDITION LAWS

INTRODUCTION

The Commentary on any law should be read with the text of the relevant law to hand as the text is not repeated in full within the Commentary. The purpose of a Commentary is not to restate the law in different words. Instead, it is to explain its purpose and underlying principle, using examples when helpful, and to draw attention to any less obvious points.

Abbreviations used throughout this Commentary

B, R, K and Y	Blue, Red, Black and Yellow Balls
Bab	the player of Blue or Black
Roy	the player of Red or Yellow
Betty, Ron, Ken, Yvonne	the players of Blue, Red, Black and Yellow respectively in doubles
ACLCL	the Association Croquet Laws Committee of the World Croquet Federation

STRUCTURE OF THE LAWS

The Laws are divided into four numbered parts, which are in turn sub-divided into lettered sections. These four parts are preceded by a glossary, which also forms part of the Laws and defines terms that are used throughout the Laws. Accompanying the Laws and placed at the end of their text are two tables, seven appendices, a handicapping schedule and a comprehensive index.

Part 1, Introduction, has three sections: 1A, summarising the game; 1B, containing laws relating to the court and its equipment; and 1C, containing laws relating to the turns and strokes that comprise the game and defining the status of the balls of the game.

Part 2, Level Singles Play, has four sections. These contain the core laws of the basic level singles game. Section 2A describes the level singles game as it should be played. Section 2B contains general laws relating to *errors* and *interferences* with play, collectively known as irregularities. Section 2C then specifies the treatment of the errors, while section 2D similarly deals with the interferences.

Part 3, Other Forms of Play, has five sections dealing with modifications to the laws of Part 2 applicable to other types of play: 3A, advanced singles play; 3B, super-advanced singles play; 3C, handicap singles play; 3D, doubles play; and 3E, shortened games. Section 3D contains laws applicable to two forms of doubles: the form that has traditionally been played, here termed ordinary doubles; and the form in which the players of a side play alternate strokes, termed alternate stroke doubles. Each form may be played as any of the four types defined above for singles: level doubles; advanced doubles; super-advanced doubles; and handicap doubles.

Part 4, Conduct of the Game, has two sections. 4A contains general laws specifying the duties and responsibilities of the players for the conduct of the game. 4B contains laws relating to special formats of play plus the overriding law dealing with the interpretation of the other laws and specifying how breaches of those laws are to be handled.

The two accompanying tables bring together and summarise how the laws deal with different situations. They are intended as a finding aid for players and referees.

The first two appendices give detailed specifications for the court and its equipment. The next four state how the main laws are to be adapted for less common types of play. The final appendix sets out the procedure for resolving an impasse in play, previously included as an official ruling.

LAWS GLOSSARY

G1 The glossary assigns specific meanings to terms that are used in more than one place in the body of the Laws. Some definitions now in the glossary occurred within the body of the Laws in the 6th Edition; others are newly defined. Where these defined terms occur in the Laws and are to have the meaning assigned in the glossary, they are identified in italics the first time they occur within each law. Subsequent occurrences of the term within that law have this same specific meaning. The same practice is followed in this commentary.

CRITICAL STROKES AND HAMPERED STROKES

G2 Most terms defined in the glossary are described in this commentary under the laws to which they apply. It is appropriate here, however, to contrast the meaning and significance of two terms: *critical stroke* and *hampered stroke*, which are relevant to different laws and have distinct meanings but in some circumstances overlap because both terms can apply to the same *stroke*.

G3 **CRITICAL STROKES** A *critical stroke* is one for which the *striker's ball* is in a *critical position* so far as the outcome of the *stroke* the *striker* is about to play is concerned.

G3.1 The *striker's ball* is in a *critical position* in relation to a hoop that the *striker* wishes the ball to pass through (whether to run it to score the hoop, or to go through for any other purpose) if a minor change in the ball's position would significantly alter the likelihood of the ball going through the hoop.

G3.2 Likewise, the *striker's ball* is in a *critical position* in relation to an obstacle (a hoop, the peg or a ball not involved in the *stroke*) if a minor change in the *striker's ball's* position would materially change the degree of obstruction caused by the obstacle. The obstacle may obstruct either the intended path of the *striker's ball* or the swing of the mallet when the *striker* plays the intended *stroke*.

G3.3 Finally, the *striker's ball* is in a *critical position* in relation to another ball that the *striker* intends to involve in the *stroke* if the two balls are close together and their relative positions are such that a minor change in the position of the *striker's ball* would materially alter the achievability of the *striker's* intended line of play. This is particularly the case when the proximity of the *striker's ball* to the other ball creates a risk of a fault.

G4 Note that an obstacle will most often be close to the *striker's ball* when it causes a *stroke* to be considered *critical*. That is not the only possibility, however. If the obstacle is another ball located some distance behind the *striker's ball* and on or close to the intended line of swing of the mallet, so that the mallet contacting that ball would be a fault, the *stroke* should be considered *critical* if the *striker's* intended backswing would reach or pass that ball. A minor sideways change in the position of the *striker's ball* could be sufficient to eliminate the obstruction.

G5 It is only the criticality of the position of the *striker's ball* that determines whether or not a *stroke* is a *critical stroke*. For example, if the *striker* is attempting to roquet a target ball of which only a sliver is visible just beyond a hoop, the *stroke* would be a *critical stroke* if the *striker's ball* were 30 cm from the hoop. A minor sideways change in its position would materially alter the difficulty of the *stroke*. But if the *striker's ball* were 5 metres from the hoop, the *stroke* would not qualify as a *critical stroke*: a minor change in the position of the *striker's ball* would make no material difference.

G6 For *strokes* played from a position close to a hoop when the *striker* is intending to score the *hoop point* for the *striker's ball*, it is the combination of the distance of the ball from the hoop and the angle that determines whether the stroke must be considered a *critical stroke*. Neither distance nor angle by itself makes the stroke critical. The determinant is whether a minor change in the position of the ball in the most unfavourable direction would materially affect the likelihood of the ball scoring the hoop.

G7 **HAMPERED STROKES** A *hampered stroke* is one in which the *striker* has to take special care because the swing of the mallet or the *striker's* stance is impeded by a hoop, the peg, or a ball that is neither in contact with the *striker's ball* nor one that the *striker* intends to *roquet* in the *stroke*. Thus, a *croquet stroke* is not hampered by the presence of the ball from which the *striker* is *taking croquet*, nor is a very short rush hampered by the proximity of the target ball to the *striker's* ball.

G8 A hoop, the peg or a ball *hampers* the swing of the mallet if their presence means the *striker* can play the intended *stroke* only with an abbreviated backswing. Any of them also hampers the swing if the *striker* has to play the stroke carefully to ensure the mallet does not hit the obstructing object on the way to hitting the *striker's ball*. A ball also hampers a stroke if it is close to and approximately level with the *striker's* ball, so that the *striker* has to be careful not to contact the ball immediately before or after hitting the *striker's* ball.

G9 A ball *hampers* a *stroke* if it is located close (in any direction) to where the *striker* would normally stand to play that stroke, requiring the *striker* to take care not to contact the ball while the stroke is being played nor while quitting the stance immediately afterwards. In most cases, a hoop or the peg will not similarly hamper a stroke by being located close to where the *striker* would stand to play the stroke (unless it also disrupts the swing of the mallet). It does not matter if the *striker* contacts the hoop or peg while playing the stroke or quitting the stance.

G10 A *stroke* that is *hampered* will be a fault if the ball is not struck by the end-face of the mallet or if the *striker's* mallet damages the court (see Law 29.2.3).

G11 **CONTRASTING CRITICAL STROKES AND HAMPERED STROKES** It is plausible that certain *strokes* must be considered both *critical* (making the law about accidental contact applicable) and *hampered* (bringing parts of the faults law into play). Some strokes will be critical but not hampered, while others may be hampered but not critical. The following examples illustrate the different possibilities.

- G11.1 The *striker's ball* runs its hoop by not much more than a mallet head length and a hoop upright limits the *striker* to playing a short poke in an attempt to *roquet* a ball a short distance directly ahead. As well as being *hampered*, this *stroke* is also a *critical stroke*, because a small change in the *striker's* ball's position would alter the difficulty of the stroke.
- G11.2 The *stroke* described in paragraph G5 above, where the *striker's ball* is close to a hoop and can hit only a sliver of the target ball, is *critical*. It is not a *hampered stroke* since neither the swing of the mallet nor the *striker's* stance is impeded.
- G11.3 The *striker's ball* runs a hoop and stops just short of another ball, which the *striker* would like to rush to the far end of the court. The presence of the hoop behind the *striker* means the *striker* cannot play such a rush but can *roquet* the other ball a shorter distance. The *stroke* is *hampered* but is not a *critical stroke* providing that the *striker* just intends to play a gentle roquet.

DEALING WITH BORDERLINE POSITIONS

B1 A number of laws require a judgement to be made about the position of a *ball at rest*. Usually a test of the ball's position will yield a clear-cut answer, but on rare occasions the most accurate test that can be done will produce a result that is on the borderline between two possibilities (e.g. whether a ball is on or off the court, or whether it has or has not scored its hoop). The 6th Edition of the Laws included guidance on deciding some of these borderline situations. The 7th Edition gives rulings on each borderline case.

B2 These rulings must not be used as substitutes for careful adjudication. They are to be invoked only when a careful and accurate test yields a borderline result, within the limits of accuracy of that test.

B3 These borderline cases and their rulings are summarised in Table 1 attached to the Laws. Each is also covered under the relevant law in this commentary. Because these situations arise only rarely, referees and players are not expected to remember the rulings, but should instead refer to Table 1 and the relevant law when a case does crop up.

B4 The borderline situations are:

- B4.1 whether a ball is off the court, Law 13.1.2 (it is off);
- B4.2 whether a ball to be placed on the *yard-line* will be in contact with another ball already on the yard-line or close to it, Law 15.9 (it is placed not in contact with the other ball);
- B4.3 whether a ball is wired from another, Law 16.5.3 (it is wired);
- B4.4 whether a ball has scored its hoop, Law 20.6.1 (it has scored it);
- B4.5 whether a ball placed for a *croquet stroke* is in a position from which it can run a hoop to score the *hoop point*, Law 20.6.2 (it can run and score the hoop from that position); and
- B4.6 whether the *striker's ball* can make hoop and roquet in the same *stroke* when there is another ball in a borderline position on the *non-playing side* of the hoop, Law 21.5 (the striker's ball cannot make hoop and roquet).

B5 There are three other borderline cases of a different type:

- B5.1 whether a fault was committed during a *stroke*, Law 29.6 (a fault is to be declared if a person adjudicating or the *striker* concludes it is more likely than not that the law was infringed);
- B5.2 whether a *stroke* about to be played is a *critical stroke*, Laws 8.5.4 and 36.4 (it is a critical stroke) or whether the stroke just played was a critical stroke, Law 8.5.4 (it was a critical stroke); and
- B5.3 whether a ball has been hit or has moved during a *stroke*, Law 55.6.2 (the opinion that there was contact or movement is generally to be preferred provided the player holding that opinion is well placed to make a judgement).

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

SECTION A: A SUMMARY OF THE GAME

C1 OBJECTIVE OF THE GAME

C1.1 This introductory statement defines the objective of the game, specifying that it may be played as either singles or doubles and as a full 26-point game or in shortened and/or time-limited forms.

C2 AN OUTLINE OF THE GAME

C2.1 This law summarises the game, and makes a number of points that are not repeated in the more detailed laws that follow. These include:

- C2.1.1 the sides play alternate turns throughout the game (Law 2.2);
- C2.1.2 the allocation of a ball or balls to each player and which balls partner each other (Law 2.3);
- C2.1.3 how *hoop points* are scored and the order in which they are scored (Law 2.4). Note that the hoop names used in Golf Croquet (hoops 1 to 12) have been adopted as the default, with the names used until now for the last 6 hoops (1-back to rover) in Association Croquet included as alternatives; and
- C2.1.4 when a ball may score a peg point or cause another ball to do so (Law 2.5).

C2.2 THE TURN

- C2.2.1 Law 2.6 specifies how a turn is played and the *strokes* that comprise a turn. It also covers the conditions under which each type of stroke entitles the *striker* to continue the turn. Note that additional strokes are earned one at a time (Laws 2.6.5 to 2.6.9). Making a *roquet* earns the striker the right only to play a *croquet stroke*. If the croquet stroke is played successfully, the striker earns the right to play a *continuation stroke*. The statement that making a roquet earns the right to two extra strokes is strictly incorrect. A turn continues as a series of strokes until a turn-ending event, as listed in Law 7.6, occurs in any stroke.
- C2.2.2 The concept of the deemed *roquet* used in earlier editions of the Laws has been eliminated. When the *striker's ball* is in contact with another ball at the start of a turn or may lawfully be and is finally placed in contact with another ball before the first *stroke*, the *striker* is required to *take croquet* immediately as the first stroke of the turn (Law 2.6.3).
- C2.2.3 Likewise, the *striker* is required to *take croquet* when the *striker's ball* is found to be in contact with a *live ball* during a turn (e.g. by running a hoop off the court and when replaced on the *yard-line* being in contact with a live ball, or in the less common situation where a live ball has to be placed on the yard-line and doing so brings it into contact with the striker's ball) (Law 2.6.7).
- C2.2.4 The perspective that the *striker* is required to *take croquet* immediately at the start of a turn or during a turn when certain conditions are fulfilled, introduced in the 7th Edition, corresponds to what happens in practice. The striker comes onto the court to begin a turn to find one ball of the side, which the striker chooses to play, in contact with another ball. The striker begins the turn by taking croquet. A *roquet* has not been made before the *croquet stroke*, nor is it necessary to say that a roquet is deemed to have been made (as was done in earlier Editions of the Laws). This required changes in the laws governing roquet and croquet strokes (Laws 17 and 18 respectively).
- C2.2.5 Law 2.6.10 specifies that the *striker's ball* may *take croquet* only once from each of the other *balls in play* during a turn unless it scores a *hoop point* for itself, which allows it to take croquet once more from each of those other balls. An alternative way of stating this is to say that all balls other than the striker's ball are *live* at the start of every turn but each becomes *dead* when croquet has been taken from it and it becomes live again when the striker's ball scores a hoop point for itself. See the definition of *live and dead balls* in the glossary.

C3 ADDITIONAL LAWS GOVERNING OTHER FORMS OF PLAY

C3.1 Two forms of doubles are now covered within the main body of the Laws: the form that has been most common where each player of a side plays only one ball throughout the game, now referred to throughout the Laws as "ordinary doubles" and the form where the players of a side play alternate *strokes* throughout the game, referred to as "alternate stroke doubles". Either form may be played as level, advanced, super-advanced or handicap doubles.

C3.2 The laws governing super-advanced play are now included within the main body of the Laws. This is not to indicate any desire on the ACLC's part to promote the use of super-advanced play, merely a recognition that in some jurisdictions this variation of the game has become more common.

SECTION B: THE COURT AND EQUIPMENT

C4 THE COURT

C4.1 Law 4.1 deals with the standard court, including tolerances in its dimensions, while Law 4.2 covers variations in size and proportions when the available area is insufficient for a full-sized court.

C4.2 The final sentence of Law 4.3.1 means that the actual *boundary* is an abstraction defined by the physical marking on the court. It is a compromise between the obvious, but impractical, definitions of being a straight line between the corners, or the ragged edge of the actual marking. "Vicinity" is left to

the referee's judgement, but will typically be taken as the length of a straight edge used to test whether a ball is on or off the court. Small areas where the marking material has missed or spilled are ignored.

C4.3 Law 4.3.2 deals with string *boundaries* and invokes Law 38.4 if such a boundary is disturbed.

C4.4 Players should check that they are happy with the locations of the hoops, the peg and the *boundaries* before they start a game. Law 4.5 specifies that after the game has started, only gross errors ('material discrepancies') such as a missing peg or hoop or a location wrong by a substantial amount may then be remedied under the overriding law (Law 63). Contrast this with the treatment of a misaligned peg or hoop (see Laws 5.1.4 and 5.2.3 respectively).

C5 EQUIPMENT

C5.1 THE PEG

- C5.1.1 The peg extension is not part of the peg for the purposes of scoring a peg point but neither is it an *outside agency* when attached to the peg (Law 5.1.3).
- C5.1.2 It is commonplace for a peg in soft ground or in a large peg hole to be knocked away from the vertical by the impact of a ball. This causes a breach of Law 5.1.1, which requires the peg to be vertical at all times. Accordingly, either player may request that a leaning peg be straightened at any time.
- C5.1.3 However, Law 5.1.4 directs that the *striker* may not gain an advantage from having the peg straightened. Thus, if the striker lays an imperfect cross-peg and then notices that straightening the peg would improve the cross-peg, the referee should check how much of each ball can be seen by the other before straightening the peg. The referee must adjust the position of either (or both) balls to ensure that they have the same size of target as before. The referee should also be aware of the positions of the uninvolved balls and ensure that adjusting either of the cross-pegged balls does not inadvertently create or destroy a wired position.
- C5.1.4 The reference to the *striker* is deliberate. The opponent can gain an advantage by requiring the peg to be straightened as long as that is done before the player becomes the striker. In practice, this will occur only when the opponent sees the striker has laid a cross-peg when the peg is leaning and requests adjustment immediately. By contrast, if the opponent delays calling attention to the leaning peg until after becoming the striker, the peg may still be straightened but the balls will be adjusted as necessary to ensure that the player, now the striker, gains no advantage thereby. Thus, the player will not be able to engineer a larger target or a wired position that did not exist before the peg was straightened.
- C5.1.5 If a wiring lift is claimed, the test must be carried out before the peg is straightened. The reference in Law 5.1.4 to Law 22.2.7 means that a ball cannot be pegged out solely as a result of the peg being straightened.
- C5.1.6 The reference in Law 5.1.4 to the tournament regulations (through Law 60.1) allows the regulations to specify that requests to have a peg corrected should not be made in time-limited games unless the correction will be material to the course of the game. This prevents Law 5.1.4 being abused by an unscrupulous player who wishes to use up time.

C5.2 HOOPS

- C5.2.1 The default specification for the width of a hoop has been changed: the minimum width is now set at $3^{11}/_{16}$ inches, rather than $3\frac{3}{4}$ inches as in the 6th and earlier Editions. While this is the default, the common practice of using hoops narrower than $3^{11}/_{16}$ inches in tournaments is accommodated by the reference in Law 5.2.1.3 to tournament and match play.
- C5.2.2 The tolerance in the height of the hoop of $+1/2$ inch to -1 inch specified in Law 5.2.1.1 allows hoops to be firmed up by knocking them into the ground as a tournament proceeds. The tolerances match those in the Golf Croquet Rules. Notwithstanding this permitted variation, a player is entitled to expect that play will not be influenced by hoops set so that

the wider base of a hoop (carrots, fins etc.) protrudes above the ground. Such a hoop does not comply with the requirement in Law 5.2.1.3 for uniformity of the spacing of the uprights.

- C5.2.3 Law 5.2.3.2 permits the *striker* to get the height of a hoop adjusted, even if it is within the tolerances specified in Law 5.2.1.1, if part of the wider base of the hoop protrudes above the ground and might impede either the striker's mallet or the passage of a ball in the *stroke* about to be played. The protruding base of a hoop is likewise not permitted to be a cause of wiring. In both cases, the hoop must be adjusted without adjusting the position of any ball. The person making the adjustment should check that the width of the hoop is within the permitted tolerance before considering the job done.
- C5.2.4 Only the *striker* is entitled to ask for a misaligned or loose hoop to be corrected and the width or height of a hoop to be checked and adjusted (Law 5.2.3.1). The opponent is not permitted to request any such check, preventing gamesmanship by the opponent requesting a hoop be checked at a critical time in the striker's turn.
- C5.2.5 Misalignment of a hoop means any or all of: the hoop leaning towards the north or south; leaning towards the east or west; or being twisted in the ground. All of these may be corrected at the *striker's* request. Any wiring test or tests of whether a ball has scored a *hoop point* or is in the *jaws*, however, must be carried out before a hoop is adjusted to correct any of these problems (see Law 5.2.3.3).
- C5.2.6 The *striker* may not gain an advantage from adjustment of the alignment of a hoop as permitted by Law 5.2.3.1. If the striker asks for a hoop to be correctly aligned after playing a hoop approach, Law 5.2.3.4 requires the position of the *striker's ball* to be adjusted if necessary to ensure that the striker faces a hoop stroke of equal difficulty after the hoop has been corrected.
- C5.2.7 A referee asked to adjust a hoop that is both misaligned and with the base of the hoop projecting above the ground must take care in deciding what, if any, adjustment of a ball's position may be required. Compensating movement of the ball may be required for an adjustment of the hoop's alignment (under Law 5.2.3.4), but not for an adjustment of the height to remove the influence of the projecting base (under Law 5.2.3.2).
- C5.2.8 A hoop that is found to be too narrow must be reset (see Law 38.2 if it is so narrow that the passage of a ball through the hoop could be materially affected by contacting both uprights simultaneously). Similarly, it must be reset if it is too wide or loose (as the law requires it to be firmly fixed). Players should not adjust, nor stamp or knock in loose hoops themselves. The *striker* should at least consult the opponent and preferably a referee (particularly if there is another game on the court that might be affected).

C5.3 **BALLS**

- C5.3.1 It is important for the balls in a set to have widths and rebound characteristics that are as similar as possible. The Tournament Referee should, if possible, check that this is so before a tournament starts, at least to the extent of ensuring that sets with different widths and/or characteristics have not got mixed up.
- C5.3.2 Temporary removal of a ball between *strokes* is permitted and is not *interference* (under Laws 34 or 36) provided the players of the game have given permission beforehand. The *striker* should be informed both before someone else removes a ball in the striker's game and after it is replaced. The position of the ball must be accurately marked beforehand and the ball must be carefully replaced. Failure to observe these requirements may entitle the striker to claim to have been misled by the *misplacement* of a ball (see Law 32).
- C5.3.3 If a ball to be removed temporarily is in a *critical position*, the *striker* must consult in accordance with Law 55.3 by either calling a referee or consulting and, if appropriate, acting jointly with the opponent. See section C55.3 below for more detail.

- C5.3.4 Reasonable pressure may be used to hold a ball in position, but not to the extent of forming a depression that might affect a *stroke* played out of it. Law 5.3.3 permits the use of grass clippings or similar material to hold a ball in position on bad ground for any stroke, not just *croquet strokes*, but they should be cleared away afterwards. Similar material is that which will hold a ball or balls in position without affecting the course of any of them.
- C5.3.5 The requirement in Law 5.3.4 not to rotate a ball before attempting to *peel* it prevents the *striker* from rotating the peelee to minimise pull when using balls with unmilled spots on the surface. It is lawful, however, for the *striker* to seek to achieve a similar effect by aligning the *striker's ball* so that its least milled spot is in contact with the intended peelee.
- C5.3.6 The requirement to preserve rotational alignment means that the *striker* must take care should it be necessary to remove the intended peelee while preparing for the *peel*. Should temporary removal be unavoidable, the ball's position must first be carefully marked and it should then be lifted carefully and not rotated while being held or wiped.

C5.4 **CLIPS**

- C5.4.1 Law 5.4.3 allows the *striker* to remove a clip at any time and requires the *striker* to do so if it may affect the outcome of the *stroke*. Even if not, a *striker* intending to run a hoop from close range should consider removing clips from the top of it, in case one springs off and causes injury. The *striker* or a referee removing clips must take care to replace them correctly.

C5.5 **MALLETS**

- C5.5.1 The basic requirements are that a mallet must have essentially identical *playing characteristics* irrespective of which end of the head is used and must not carry artificial aids (see Laws 5.5.1 to 5.5.4). This rules out mallets with different materials or weightings in the construction of each end of the head, off-centre shafts, shafts that are not vertical below the top grip or mallets adorned with laser gun-sights, mirrors and any other products of fertile imaginations and long winter evenings. It is implicit in the definition that the head has only one pair of end-faces, thus use of the sides, or a hexagonal head, is not permitted. Heads with an I-shaped cross-section are permitted.
- C5.5.2 The 7th Edition has dropped the requirement that materials from which a mallet head may be constructed must give no significant playing advantage over a head made entirely of wood. Some long-used methods of mallet construction (e.g. peripheral weighting) are arguably in breach of this requirement and it is difficult to specify types of construction that ought to be proscribed. This does not mean the ACLC accepts there can be open slather on mallet construction; it will monitor any trends that may emerge. The requirement that the two ends of the head must not differ in their *playing characteristics* remains absolute, as does the requirement that, barring accidents, only one mallet may be used during a turn.
- C5.5.3 Croquet has followed golf in banning grips or shafts moulded to the shape of the player's hands (see Law 5.5.2). This requirement is relaxed for disabled players provided they gain no advantage over a player without the relevant disability using a normal shaft (Law 5.5.5).
- C5.5.4 Mallets may be changed between turns but not within a turn unless the original mallet has suffered damage affecting use. The governing principle is that the *striker* should not gain any advantage. The overriding law (Law 63) may occasionally be needed. An opponent realised that her mallet was being used, accidentally and without permission, by the *striker* who was in a promising break. She demanded the return of her property forthwith. Common sense, via Law 63, indicated that the mallet should immediately be returned and the *striker* continue with his own mallet, whether or not he would gain an advantage by the change.

C6 **ACCESSORIES**

- C6.1 The exact placement of *corner pegs*, if they are used, is important for defining the square yard of the corner area. They must be placed so that the further side of the peg is one yard from the corner

and the *boundary* is tangential to the inner side of the peg. This placement facilitates judgements about where a ball goes off the court in the vicinity of the corner.

SECTION C: GENERAL LAWS GOVERNING PLAY

C7 START AND END OF A GAME AND TURN

C7.1 WHEN A GAME STARTS A game starts when the first *stroke* is played, or when the *striker* declares that it has been played since Law 8.8 specifies that a declaration counts as a stroke. In time-limited games, the clock should start when the mallet hits the ball or when the declaration is made. In ordinary doubles, a player can declare that a stroke has been played by an absent *partner* (Laws 8.8 and 45.1).

C7.2 WHEN A GAME ENDS A game does not end until the players have quitted the court (or started another game on it) and agreed which side has won. The definition is significant because the end of the game is the ultimate *limit of claims* for irregularities in play. There is no requirement that the players' agreement as to who has won should be correct. Almost always, the players do agree correctly who has won but time-limited games occasionally give rise to confusion between players who cannot add up. If the players agree incorrectly that one side has won and quit the court, the game has ended with that result. Should each player quit the court believing that he/she has won (or lost) the game, no agreement has been reached and the game has not ended until someone sorts out the score and obtains the players' agreement. If the time-limit has expired, no further play will be possible unless the scores were actually level or an *interference* is *discovered* that requires play to be taken back in time under Law 61.3.2, but the game will end only when the players have worked out the true result. Reporting the result to the manager will cause the confusion to be discovered.

C7.3 WHEN TURNS START AND END One turn starts as soon as the preceding turn ends and there are two distinct definitions of when that moment occurs.

C7.3.1 In the normal course of events (Law 7.5.1), a turn ends when the last *stroke* of the turn has been played and the balls and clips have then been correctly positioned (i.e. after replacing balls on the *yard-line* and placing clips on the correct hoops). This definition does not depend on whether the *striker* has quitted the court.

C7.3.2 The second definition, in Law 7.5.2, covers two other cases. The first (Law 7.5.2.1) is when the *striker* incorrectly thinks that the turn has ended (e.g. having forgotten an entitlement to another *stroke*). This definition of end of turn requires both that the striker quits the court in the belief that the turn has ended and that the opponent then plays a stroke. The order is important.

C7.3.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy takes off with R too hard but makes a glancing *roquet* on B in the *stroke* before R leaves the court. Roy assumes wrongly that his turn has ended and replaces R on the *yard-line*. Before Roy has had time to quit the court, Bab impatiently steps on, plays K and roquets R. By doing so, Bab has played when not entitled, playing a stroke while Roy's turn is still lawfully in progress (because he has not quitted the court) and Law 26 applies. If Roy now quits the court but realises his mistake before he plays the first stroke of his next turn, Roy can *forestall* Bab and resume his turn under Law 26.1.2 after replacing all the balls correctly as required by Law 26.2.

C7.3.3 The second case (Law 7.5.2.2) is when a player volunteers permission for or, having been asked, allows the opponent to get on with the game while the player goes to retrieve a ball that must be replaced on the *yard-line*, or places a clip on a distant hoop. In contrast, the second player has no grounds for grievance if, having assumed that the first player will not mind rather than having been given permission, the second player hits a long *roquet* and is then required by the first player to *replay*. If the players have come to a tacit understanding that permission is implicitly granted, however, (e.g. by each player playing at least once before the other has placed balls and clips correctly as Law 7.5.1 requires and with the opponent not objecting) then the ex-striker cannot withdraw it retrospectively.

C7.3.4 For handicap play, Law 7.5 is modified as specified in Law 42.3.4: see section C42.4 below.

- C7.3.5 In time-limited games, a modified and more precise definition of when a turn ends is used for the purposes of determining which side is in play when time is called. See Law 61.1.2 and paragraph C61.2 below.

C8 PLAYING A STROKE AND DEFINITION OF THE STRIKING PERIOD

C8.1 WHAT CONSTITUTES A STROKE

- C8.1.1 A *stroke* is defined very generally in the glossary as “the *striker’s* attempt to hit a *ball at rest* with a mallet as part of a turn ...”. This contains ideas that are crucial for the interpretation of several laws. First, it implies that the striker must intend to hit the ball for a stroke to occur. How then should the Laws treat a contact between mallet and ball before the striker intends to hit the ball?
- C8.1.2 There has long been controversy over such accidental contacts between the mallet and the *striker’s ball* – particularly contacts while casting, but also contact with the ball when a player who does not cast and hit continuously is placing the mallet behind the ball. The concern is that a ball in a *critical position* might be replaced after such an accidental contact in a position that is more to the *striker’s* advantage. In the 7th Edition of the Laws this has led to the introduction of new laws dealing with such accidental contacts. See section C8.3 below.
- C8.1.3 Secondly, it is only an attempt to hit a *ball at rest* that constitutes a *stroke*, and the glossary definitions mean that only a ball that is part of the game can be a ball at rest. How then should the Laws treat the *striker* deliberately striking a ball that is not part of the game and accordingly is an *outside agency*?
- C8.1.4 There are two policy reasons why a “stroke” in which the *striker* hits a ball that is not part of the game is regarded as a nullity, rather than a case of playing the *wrong ball*. First, in the common case where a double-banked ball is being addressed, it is desirable for the opponent to be able to *forestall* to prevent disruption to the other game, and the players in the other game cannot reasonably be prevented from protecting their property! Secondly, a colour-blind player who may be confused by the presence of additional balls should not be penalised.
- C8.1.5 It is desirable that the Laws should cover not just these cases, where the *striker* strikes a ball that is an *outside agency*, but also other cases where the striker involves such a *ball in play* in place of a ball of the game. In the 7th Edition these cases are treated as an *interference* with play, covered by Law 33. See section C33 below.

C8.2 WHEN A STROKE MAY BE PLAYED

- C8.2.1 A *stroke* may lawfully be played when all of the *balls in play* are at rest or one or more of them has been moved temporarily to avoid interference (and may therefore be in hand or may have been relocated on the court) (Law 8.1.1).
- C8.2.2 A *stroke* may also be played while balls moved by the preceding stroke are still moving provided the *striker’s ball* is at rest in a lawful position and playing the second stroke would not affect the outcome of either of them (Law 8.1.2). There are two situations in which one stroke may affect the other.
- C8.2.2.1 A moving ball from the second *stroke* interferes with a ball from the first stroke that is still moving. The most likely interference is when the *striker* has played a stop shot and plays the *continuation stroke* before the croqueted ball has come to rest. If the continuation stroke is played as a rush that sends the *roqueted* ball near to the still-moving croqueted ball, there is interference if the two balls collide.
- C8.2.2.2 After the second *stroke* has been played, something occurs in the first stroke which ends the turn, making the *striker* not entitled to play the second stroke at all.
- C8.2.3 In either situation, the second *stroke* must be treated as the *striker* playing when not entitled under Law 26. The balls moved in the second stroke must be replaced where they

were before the stroke and any ball(s) moving as a result of the first stroke that were interfered with by the second stroke must be placed where they would otherwise have come to rest. In the first situation (but clearly not the second), the striker may then resume the turn.

C8.3 ACCIDENTAL CONTACTS

C8.3.1 **ACCIDENTAL CONTACT IN A CRITICAL STROKE** The 7th Edition makes a major change from previous policy with regard to accidental contacts when the *stroke* is a *critical stroke*, i.e. when the *striker's ball* is in a *critical position* as far as the intended outcome of the stroke is concerned. (See section G3 above for a general characterisation of critical strokes.) In a critical stroke, any contact between the mallet and a ball counts as a stroke (Law 8.5.1.1) and if the ball contacted is not the striker's ball, the stroke is necessarily a fault under Law 29.1.11. An accidental contact in a critical stroke is likely to cause the *striker's* turn to end, because it will probably not achieve anything that would entitle the striker to continue.

C8.3.2 **ACCIDENTAL CONTACT IN A NON-CRITICAL STROKE** If a *stroke* is not a *critical stroke*, an accidental contact between the mallet and a ball before the *striker* intended to strike the *striker's ball* does not count as a stroke. If such an accidental contact occurs and the striker is aware of it, the striker must attempt to avoid a further contact between the mallet and the striker's ball (Law 8.5.2.1). If the striker successfully avoids a further contact, the stroke and *striking period* are annulled and the striker may begin to play the stroke again once any balls disturbed have been replaced (Law 8.5.2.3).

C8.3.3 The Official Ruling on Law 8.5.2 limits the scope of that law to contacts between the mallet and the *striker's ball* or the ball from which it is *taking croquet*. A *stroke* cannot be considered *non-critical* if the mallet contacts any other ball during the *striking period*.

C8.3.4 If the *striker* successfully annuls a *non-critical stroke* following an accidental contact, the striker is not obliged to attempt the same *stroke* the second time. There is a restriction on what the striker may then do, however. In the new stroke, the striker may not attempt any *critical stroke* that could have been an alternative to the non-critical one just annulled (Law 8.5.2.3).

C8.3.4.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab runs hoop 5 with K but the hoop obstructs an attempt to *roquet* the nearby R. Bab decides to try to roquet B in corner III, a shot that is not obstructed by the hoop and is not a *critical stroke*. While casting, Bab accidentally moves K. She successfully annuls the *stroke* and replaces K. She now decides that, after all, she would prefer to try to roquet R. She may not do that, however, as it would be a critical stroke and she is forbidden from attempting a critical stroke following the accidental contact. She is still entitled to try to roquet B.

C8.3.5 Following an accidental contact in a *non-critical stroke*, if there is a further contact between the end-face of the mallet and the *striker's ball* in a swing in which the *striker* intended to strike it, the *stroke* is played (Law 8.5.2.2). It does not matter whether the further contact is unintentional (the striker attempted to halt the mallet in its final swing but failed) or deliberate (the striker carried on regardless after the accidental contact and deliberately struck the striker's ball).

C8.3.6 Should the *striker's* mallet make a further contact with the *striker's ball*, the *stroke* must be analysed to check that no fault has been committed. An accidental contact, however it occurred, is ignored for this purpose but is otherwise treated as part of the stroke.

C8.3.6.1 **EXAMPLE** When the *striker* is about to play a rush, the bottom of the mallet just brushes the *striker's ball* on a backswing. The striker carries on and plays the *stroke*. The stroke is valid, and the accidental contact between the ball and the bottom of the mallet is not itself a fault, nor does it make the subsequent contact between the face of the mallet and the ball a double-tap. The striker might, however, be reminded of

the obligation under Law 8.5.2.1 to attempt to avoid a further contact with the striker's ball following an accidental contact.

C8.3.6.2 EXAMPLE The *striker* is about to play a *croquet stroke* but while casting, the mallet just contacts the ball from which croquet is being taken in the last backswing the striker intended to make, separating the balls slightly. Surprised, the striker attempts to halt the forward swing, but the end-face of the mallet contacts the *striker's ball*. According to Law 8.5.2.2, the *stroke* is played (and will probably not have been played as the striker intended). The stroke is not a fault just because of the accidental contact with the croqueted ball (Law 8.5.2.2 again), although it may be susceptible to being faulted for other reasons because the balls were separated when the stroke was played.

C8.3.7 If the *striker* is about to play a *stroke* that would be a *critical stroke* but the *striker's ball* has first been marked by a referee or to the joint satisfaction of the players (not just casually marked by the striker), the stroke is treated as non-critical should there be an accidental contact with the *striker's ball* (Law 8.5.1.2). Law 8.5.2 rather than Law 8.5.1 would then apply. The rationale for this is that if the ball were disturbed by an accidental contact, it could be accurately replaced.

C8.3.8 For *non-critical strokes*, the provision of Law 8.5.2 requiring the *striker* to attempt to avoid a further contact with the *striker's ball* following an accidental contact but not penalising the striker if a further contact does occur is important. It removes any incentive for the opponent to claim, correctly or incorrectly, that an accidental contact occurred when the striker played a *stroke*. The outcome of the stroke would be unaffected by whether or not the opponent's claim had any foundation.

C8.3.9 ADJUDICATING CLOSE POSITIONS

C8.3.9.1 If the *striker* is about to play a *stroke* that the players agree, or a referee decides is, on the borderline between being critical and not critical, the stroke must be taken to be a *critical stroke* (Law 8.5.4). This may influence what the striker may do in that stroke, as specified in Law 8.5. In particular, Law 8.5.1.1 will mean that an accidental contact will count as the stroke. Secondly, Law 8.5.2.3 may limit what the striker is permitted to do after having annulled a non-critical stroke.

C8.3.9.2 The same borderline judgement, specified in Law 8.5.4, applies to a *stroke* that the *striker* has just played. A post-facto judgement about the nature of the stroke will affect how an accidental contact during the stroke must be treated. The post-facto judgement that the stroke was *critical* may also mean that the striker has just played a stroke that was not permitted under Law 8.5.2.3 after having annulled a non-critical stroke, a situation that may need to be remedied using the overriding law.

C8.4 WHEN A STROKE AND THE STRIKING PERIOD START To make sense of the changes to the laws about accidental contacts, the definition of when the *striking period* and a *stroke* start must be changed, making them both more extended in time. Law 8.2 specifies that both start when the *striker* takes up a stance with the apparent intent to play the stroke (i.e. when it appears to an observer that the striker has taken a stance from which the stroke will be played, even if the striker may only be intending to try out whether the stroke would be possible). This is the same definition as is used in the 5th Edition (2018) of the Golf Croquet Rules.

C8.5 PLAYING A STROKE Once a *stroke* has been started and not cancelled as specified in Law 8.4, it is played when:

C8.5.1 the mallet strikes the *striker's ball* (Law 8.3.1); or

C8.5.2 a fault is committed (e.g. the mallet hits another ball or moves another ball by hitting a hoop etc., Law 8.3.2); or

- C8.5.3 the *striker* accidentally fails to make contact with the *striker's ball* (plays an air shot, Law 8.3.3). This includes cases where the mallet fails to reach the ball, as well as those where it misses the ball by accidentally going past the side or over the top of it.

C8.6 CANCELLING A STROKE

- C8.6.1 A *stroke* is not played if the *striker* deliberately stops or diverts the mallet and succeeds in avoiding hitting any ball with it or committing a fault (Law 8.4.1.2). In that case both the stroke and the *striking period* are cancelled. Both are also cancelled if the *striker* steps away from the stance under control before playing the stroke (Law 8.4.1.1).
- C8.6.2 It may be up to a referee to decide whether the *striker* cancelled the *stroke* or missed the ball and thereby played it. 'Stopping or diverting the mallet' in Law 8.4.1.2 must be interpreted as a continuous process starting before the *striker* is aware that a miss has occurred or is inevitable, and ending when the *striker* regains control of the mallet and stance at the end of a truncated swing.
- C8.6.3 After a *stroke* has been cancelled in this way, the *striker* is not required to repeat the stroke originally attempted. The *striker* may not only decide to play a different stroke (subject to the restriction specified in paragraph C8.3.4 above) but, if the stroke is the first stroke of a turn and the *striker's ball* has not been chosen, may decide to play the other ball of the side. It is as though the *striker* had never started the cancelled stroke.

C8.7 THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN CANCELLING AND ANNULLING A STROKE Law 8.4 uses the term "cancelled" to describe a *stroke* that the *striker* voluntarily stops without having contacted any ball with the mallet or committed a fault (see paragraph C8.6.1). The *striker* will usually do this when a problem has arisen or a mistake will occur if the stroke is continued. Law 8.5.2.3 uses the term "annulled" to describe a *non-critical stroke* that the *striker* stops after having accidentally contacted a ball (see paragraph C8.3.2). In both cases, the *striker* is entitled to begin the stroke again after having replaced any ball that may have moved. Note that a critical stroke cannot be annulled.

C8.8 WHEN THE STRIKING PERIOD ENDS The *striking period* ends when the *striker* quits the stance under control (Law 8.6). It is permissible, however, for the *striker* to play a second *stroke* from the same stance as a first, without moving out of the stance in between (see Law 8.2). For example, the *striker* may play a very gentle *croquet stroke* to approach a hoop and then run the hoop from the same stance without moving in between. In that case, the striking period of the first stroke ends (and the striking period of the second stroke starts simultaneously) when the next stroke starts – that is when the *striker* begins to swing the mallet for the purpose of playing the second stroke (Law 8.2).

C8.9 QUITTING THE STANCE When the *striker* quits the stance under control is a matter that may have to be decided by a referee observing the *stroke* (whether active on the court or inactive and observing from the sidelines if appealed to). The *striker* must make a controlled movement that is not just an attempt to avoid being hit by a ball. For example, if a player takes one or more quick steps away from the stance, or jumps aside or makes some other rapid movement, but still gets hit by a ball or contacts another ball, a referee may be justified in ruling that the *striker* had not quitted the stance under control. The referee could make the same ruling if the *striker* had to play a stroke using a stance *hampered* by a nearby ball and then moved that ball while moving away from the stance. By contrast, if a player remained in the stance watching a long take-off to its end and then in the first step trod on the stationary croqueted ball, a referee could judge that the player had quitted the stance under control and treading on the ball was not a fault. The player might nevertheless be spoken to about wasting time!

C8.10 DECLARATION OF A STROKE

- C8.10.1 The *striker* may opt to leave the balls where they are by declaring a *stroke* to have been played, ending the turn (Law 8.8). If this is done at the beginning of a turn, the *striker* should declare which ball is played by leaving it where it lies, but the opponent is entitled to take a simple utterance (the word "deem" may well be used for historical reasons) or even a wave of the hand, as an irrevocable declaration. Failure to indicate to which ball of the side the declaration applies causes the *striker* to become responsible for the positions of both of them (see Law 16.2.2.2). A declaration is instantaneous and has no *striking period*.

C8.10.2 Law 8.8.1 means that a *stroke* may be declared at any time when the *striker* is entitled to play a stroke under Law 8.1. Note in particular the implications of the combination of Laws 8.8.1 and 8.1.2. A stroke may be declared while the previous stroke is still in progress provided the *striker's ball* is at rest in a lawful position. A player may be able to take advantage of this combination of laws to gain an extra turn in a time-limited game by quickly declaring a stroke to have been played just before the time-limit expires.

C8.11 **OTHER CONTACT BETWEEN Mallet AND BALL** Law 8.9 specifically allows the time-honoured practice of "trundling": using a mallet to move a ball into position for a *stroke*.

C9 CHANGES IN THE STATUS OF A BALL

C9.1 BALL IN PLAY

C9.1.1 Law 9.1 is now more explicit that a ball becomes a *ball in play* (and hence part of the game) only when it is placed on the court in the position from which it is played into the game, or in the position where the *striker* chooses to leave it by declaring a *stroke* to have been played with it. From the time it is placed in that position until the end of the stroke in which it is pegged out, it is at all times either a ball in play or a *ball in hand*.

C9.1.2 If the *striker* of the game's first or second turn places both balls of the side on the court, only the one played into the game becomes a *ball in play*, even if the other is not removed from the court.

C9.2 BALL IN HAND

C9.2.1 A *ball in hand* is an *outside agency* (Law 9.2.1), but when the *striker's ball* makes a *roquet* it becomes in hand only when it comes to rest (as implied by Law 9.2.2.3 and its reference to Law 18.1), leaves the court (Law 9.2.1.2), or is picked up or arrested (which may be done to save time only when the ball is clearly not going to hit or be hit by another one, Law 9.2.2.2). The *striker's ball* can move or even *peel* another ball before becoming in hand. Contrast that with going off the court, when it immediately becomes in hand and an *outside agency*.

C9.2.2 When the ball the *striker* chooses as the *striker's ball* is in contact with another ball at the start of the turn, the *striker's ball* is a *ball in hand* before the *croquet stroke* (see Law 9.2.2.3) even if the *striker* chooses to play the *stroke* without moving the *striker's ball* from the position it lawfully occupied at the end of the previous turn. See paragraph C20.2.1 for the implications for a ball running and scoring its *hoop in order*.

C9.3 **BALL AT REST** Law 9.3.1.2 specifies that a ball ceases to be a *ball in hand* and becomes a *ball at rest* not only when it is placed in a lawful position on the court but also at the start of the next *stroke* if it is left in a *misplaced* position. This may appear to be an abstruse point, but it is relevant should the *striker* fail to *take croquet* when required to do so, doing something else instead. The *striker's ball* will inevitably be misplaced at the start of that other stroke, but because of this law it will have the status of a ball at rest rather than a ball in hand and an *outside agency* when the stroke is played. The stroke will be covered, as intended, by Law 28.6, rather than being treated as a case of striking an *outside agency*!

C9.4 WHEN A BALL COMES TO REST

C9.4.1 In most circumstances a ball may be considered to have come to rest when it appears to have stopped moving (Law 9.4.3). Most often, the final position of a ball is not critical and the criterion is satisfied by a fairly casual inspection. Subsequent movement under the influence of gravity, wind or compressed grass can be treated as movement between *strokes*.

C9.4.2 There are occasions when more care is needed and they occur when a ball may have come to rest in a *critical position*: a position to which a minor change could materially affect future play, such as determining if a turn ends or a point is scored or a ball is wired.

C9.4.3 Law 9.4 creates two categories of *critical position*: 'critical but not testable' (Law 9.4.2) and 'critical and testable' (Law 9.4.1). The latter are listed in Law 55.3.1.4 and, in relation to whether a ball has come to rest, are restricted to cases when a ball may or may not:

C9.4.3.1 have scored a *hoop point*; or

C9.4.3.2 be in position to score a *hoop point* (or, by analogy, affect whether a hoop may be scored and/or a *roquet* made); or

C9.4.3.3 be off the court.

These testable positions must be agreed or adjudicated by the players or a referee and the ball cannot be considered to have come to rest until the test has been done (Law 9.4.1).

C9.4.4 Critical but not testable positions are subject to the less onerous requirement that the position of the relevant ball must appear to remain unchanged for at least 5 seconds (Law 9.4.2). If it moves after that, it is replaced.

C9.4.5 To see how this should be applied in practice, consider the following situations.

C9.4.5.1 On a fast court with a significant slope, the *striker's ball* comes up the slope, then rolls straight back down again to end some distance away. Although it momentarily stopped moving when it reversed direction, that is not sufficient to satisfy Law 9.4.3 so it is not replaced in the higher position.

C9.4.5.2 The *striker's ball* just staggers through its hoop and appears to stop having clearly run it. The *striker* notices, however, that it almost immediately starts to creep back and does so for 15 seconds, by which time it is back in the *jaws*. It is not replaced as it had not remained stationary in a *critical position* for the required 5 seconds.

C9.4.5.3 The *striker's ball* just staggers through its hoop, apparently stopping in a position where the *striker* thinks it has run the hoop, but is not certain. The *striker* asks the opponent to come and check, but before the opponent gets there the ball falls back into the hoop. It was in a *critical position* needing a test which had not been done, so it is not replaced.

C9.4.5.4 As in paragraph C9.4.5.3, but this time the *striker* is more confident and, out of courtesy, asks whether the opponent wants to check. The opponent is happy to trust the *striker's* judgement. While the *striker* is sizing up the next shot, the ball falls back into the hoop. In this case, the earlier position had been agreed, so the ball is considered to have come to rest and is replaced there under Law 36.2.1 (a ball moving between strokes).

C9.4.5.5 The *striker's ball* just staggers through its hoop, apparently stopping in a position in which it has clearly run it, but leaving a *hindered* shot. The *striker* is looking at options when the ball rolls back into the *jaws*. A referee should ask the *striker* whether the ball had stopped moving and, if so, whether 5 seconds had elapsed since then. The ball should be replaced in the position where it had run the hoop only if the *striker* is confident of both.

C9.4.5.6 After a poor hoop stroke, Roy replays his swing, places his clip on the hoop and walks off the court. Bab comes on and looks to see whether the ball can run the hoop next time, only to find that it is now through. After checking with Roy that it had moved since he last saw it, the ball is replaced where Roy believed it had stopped, and Bab plays the first *stroke* of her turn. The ball was in a position that was *critical* but did not need to be tested and accordingly Law 7.5.1 (occurrence of an event causing end of turn) had been satisfied and Roy's turn had ended.

C9.5 LIVE AND DEAD BALLS

C9.5.1 It is lawful to cause the *striker's ball* to hit a *dead ball* but that is not a *roquet* and no further *stroke* is earned as a result, although if the *striker's* ball continues on to roquet a *live ball* or score a *hoop point*, the *striker* is entitled to continue the turn.

- C9.5.2 If the *striker's ball* comes to rest in contact with a *dead ball* after a *croquet stroke*, the *striker* is entitled to play the *striker's ball* as it lies in the *continuation stroke*. The *striker* may play away from the *dead ball* or play into it so that both balls move. What the *striker* must not do is adjust the *striker's ball* around the *dead ball* before playing the *stroke*. That constitutes the *error* of playing an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball* (see Law 28.4), for which the penalty is end of turn. This fate does not preclude the *striker* from temporarily lifting either ball under Law 5.3.2 to wipe it, but the *striker* would be well advised to have a good reason for doing so (such as a large blob of mud on the ball) and must inform the opponent first.
- C9.5.3 Laws 9.5.2 and 28.5.2 mean that if a player *roquets* Red but then plays an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *live* Blue, Blue becomes *dead* and the *striker* remains alive on Red. Blue reverts to being live if the *error* is *discovered* within its *limit of claims* and *rectified*.

PART 2: LEVEL SINGLES PLAY

SECTION A: LAWFUL PLAY

C10 DECISIONS ABOUT THE ORDER OF PLAY

C10.1 In some competitions, the outcome of the toss may be pre-determined.

C10.2 Choices of lead or colours may not be revoked once validly made, except when the players *discover* sometime after the start of the fifth turn that they have both started every earlier turn by playing a *wrong ball*. When that mix-up is discovered, the initial choice of balls is reversed, the players continuing to play the balls they have been using rather than those they initially chose (see Law 27.6).

C11 THE START OF A GAME

C11.1 In the first four ordinary (i.e. non-bisque) turns, the balls must be played into the game from the *baulk-lines*. If the ball to be played into the game can be placed on a *baulk-line* touching a *ball in play*, however, the *striker* may play it into the game by *taking croquet* immediately from that other ball, in which case the *striker's ball* need not be on the *baulk-line* when the *stroke* is played. There are other exceptions: in advanced play when the player of the second or third turn scores hoop 10 (4-back); and in super-advanced play when the player of either of those turns scores hoop 7 (1-back) and so concedes a contact. A ball must still be played into the game, but the *striker* may start the turn by taking croquet from any ball in play (see Law 11.2.2.2). There is a further exception in super-advanced play when the player of the second or third turn scores hoop 10 (4-back) and so concedes a free placement. The ball that must next be played into the game may be played from any position on the court, including any position within the *yard-line area* (see Law 11.2.2.3).

C11.2 In handicap play, *bisques* may be played before all the balls have been played into the game (see Laws 11.1 and 11.2), although it will seldom be tactically wise to do so.

C11.3 The situation described in Law 11.2.3, where the player of the fourth turn is unable to play a correct ball, is covered in paragraph C27.4 below.

C12 CHOICE OF STRIKER'S BALL

C12.1 Once all of the balls have been played into the game, there are only two ways of choosing the *striker's ball*, namely playing a *stroke* with it or lifting a ball of the side when entitled to do so under Laws 16 (wiring lift) or 39 (advanced play) or 40 (super-advanced play).

C12.2 Lifting a ball chooses it as the *striker's ball* only if three conditions are all met:

- C12.2.1 it is a ball of the *striker's side*; and
- C12.2.2 it is not in contact with its *partner ball* (for a lift under Laws 39 or 40); and
- C12.2.3 the *striker* is entitled to a lift under any of Laws 16, 39 and 40 (Law 12.2.2).

C12.3 Lifting an enemy ball or lifting a ball of one's own side in the absence of a lift is an *interference* to which Law 36 (interference with a ball between strokes) applies. If the mistake is not noticed before a *stroke* is played, it will result in an *error* being committed under either Law 27 (wrong ball) or Law 28.8 (lifting a ball when not entitled to do so).

C12.4 A ball may be 'lifted' by moving it in any way that differs from playing a *stroke* (see Law 12.3). Trundling using the side of the mallet is lawful, as is trundling using the face of the mallet, but the latter is safe only if the action is clearly distinguishable from that used to play a stroke.

C12.5 In very rare instances, the *striker* may be confronted by the two balls of the side very close together at the start of a turn and the striker wishes to hit one without disturbing the other (e.g. to *rocket* a nearby third ball). The striker calls a referee to watch the *stroke*. While the striker may be intending to hit one ball (and may tell the referee so), if a stroke is played in which the mallet hits only the other ball and does so lawfully, that validly selects it as the *striker's ball* for the turn under Law 12.2.1 and the stroke should be considered lawful. This does not apply, of course, if only one of the two balls belongs to the striker's side, nor if the situation occurs during a turn when one of them has already been chosen as the striker's ball. If the striker hits the other ball in either of those cases, a referee watching the stroke, or the striker, should rule the stroke to be a fault rather than a case of playing the *wrong ball*. The justification for this ruling is that the striker plays a wrong ball under Law 27.1 by deliberately (albeit erroneously) striking a ball other than the striker's ball, whereas the striker commits a fault under Law 29.1.11 by accidentally causing the mallet to hit a ball other than the striker's ball.

C13 BALL OFF THE COURT

C13.1 The *boundary* should be imagined as an invisible vertical wall that touches the inside of the boundary marking. It does not matter if the court surface is not flat at the relevant point.

C13.2 A ball goes off the court as soon as it touches the imaginary wall (see Law 13.1.1) and immediately becomes an *outside agency*, so if it comes back onto the court and hits another ball, that ball must be replaced. In rare cases, the opponent may claim that a ball approached and crossed the *boundary*, either perpendicularly or at a shallow angle, and then fell back or curved back into court before coming to rest. If the ball is only just in court when tested, this claim may have merit. It should be granted, however, only if the opponent was well placed to observe the claimed movement and the same effect can be demonstrated repeatedly in tests conducted by the referee.

C13.3 A ball that hits a *corner peg* should not necessarily be placed on the *corner spot*. If the ball hits the corner peg a glancing blow, it should be withdrawn back along its line of travel to find the point at which it first overlapped the inner edge of the *boundary marking*. The extreme case would occur when a ball on the Corner I spot is struck towards Corner II and just touches the out-court side of the southern corner peg. This ball should be placed 13 feet (4 metres) south of Corner II!

C13.4 The *striker* should always take care to observe precisely where balls go off the court. If there is a possibility of a *cannon*, such as shooting from B-baulk at two adjacent west *yard-line* balls, the striker should have the outcome watched, for example by asking the opponent to stand near the target balls.

C13.5 **ADJUDICATING A CLOSE POSITION** If a test to determine whether a ball is on or off the court concludes that the matter is too close to call (noting that there may be uncertainty in locating the exact edge of a painted *boundary marking*), the decision shall be that the ball is off the court (see Law 13.1.2 and the section of this Commentary on borderline positions that follows the glossary). A suitable test is to place two vertical surfaces, each touching the boundary from the court side, one on either side of the ball, and then sight horizontally along the surfaces to see whether the ball protrudes beyond the plane of the two surfaces. The playing faces of two mallets (not the mallets' sides), with those playing faces touching the boundary from the court side, provide suitable surfaces.

C13.6 **CONSULTING A REFEREE OR THE OPPONENT** Before testing whether a ball is on or off the court, the *striker* must consult in accordance with the requirements of Law 55.3 by either calling a referee to carry out the test or consulting the opponent and, if the opponent so desires, testing the position jointly. See section C55.3 below for more detail.

C14 BALL IN THE YARD-LINE AREA

C14.1 Law 14 sets out the distinction between when the *striker's ball* and other *balls at rest* in the *yard-line area* at the end of a *stroke* must be placed on the *yard-line*. The implications for handicap play when the *striker* chooses to take a *half-bisque* or *bisque* are covered in Law 42.3.4 and paragraph C42.4.3 below.

C15 PLACEMENT OF A BALL ON THE YARD-LINE

C15.1 Placing a ball on the *yard-line* means that the ball should be placed so that its centre is a yard from the inside edge of the (idealised) line marking the *boundary*. Players usually determine the position by using the shaft of the mallet as a measuring rod, having previously worked out (and perhaps marked) what position on the shaft determines the one yard distance exactly. In *critical positions*, or if there is a dispute between the players, a yard-stick may be needed to check the placement.

C15.2 PLACEMENT WHEN OTHER BALLS AT REST INTERFERE

C15.2.1 If a ball has to be placed on the *yard-line* in accordance with Law 15.1 but one or more other balls on the *yard-line* or close to it prevent the placement of the ball in the required position, the ball must be placed on the *yard-line* and in contact with any of the balls that interfere with its placement, as the *striker* chooses (Law 15.2).

C15.2.2 Law 15.3 explains the concepts of direct and indirect interference, while Law 15.2 specifies that direct and indirect interference are to be treated on the same basis. To illustrate the implications, consider the following example.

C15.2.2.1 **EXAMPLE** R and Y are just less than a ball's width apart on the south *yard-line*, with Y west of R. K shoots at the two balls and misses, going off the court where its placement on the *yard-line* as required by Law 15.1.1 is just prevented by the eastern edge of R. R directly interferes with the placement of K. In the absence of R, Y would not interfere with the placement of K. But R is present and Law 15.2.2 permits K to be placed on the *yard-line* in contact with R on either side. K cannot be placed in contact with R on its western side, however, because of the presence of Y. Y indirectly interferes with the placement of K. Because Law 15.2 treats direct and indirect interference on the same basis, K may be placed on the *yard-line* in contact either with R on its eastern side or with Y on its western side, as the *striker* chooses. If K is placed in contact with Y, it will be more than 3 ball-widths from its position had there been no interfering balls!

C15.2.3 The same concepts of direct and indirect interference, and options for replacing a ball apply if one or more of the interfering balls is infield from the *yard-line* but sufficiently close that a ball placed on the *yard-line* can be in contact with it.

C15.2.4 There are no special provisions for replacing balls in or near corners. Hence, if Roy plays the second turn of the game by shooting with R from the end of A-baulk at B in corner IV and misses into the corner, he will normally place R on the west side of B to minimise the target for Bab in the third turn. If Bab now likewise shoots with K at R and misses into the corner, she is entitled to place K in contact with either B or R. She may be expected to place K in contact with R, to give only a single-ball target for Y.

C15.3 **BALLS ON THE YARD-LINE NOT IN A STRAIGHT LINE** The situation envisaged in Law 15.7 is where three balls have been placed at different points on the *yard-line* and the *striker*, intending to play one of the outer balls and *roquet* the middle one, finds that the one behind it is visible. The balls should be adjusted by as little as possible to make them all lie on a straight line with none of them less than a yard from the *boundary*.

C15.4 CONSULTING A REFEREE OR THE OPPONENT

C15.4.1 Before placing a ball on the *yard-line* when there is doubt whether it may be in contact with another ball, the *striker* must consult in accordance with the requirements of Law 55.3 by either calling a referee to adjudicate or consulting the opponent and, if the opponent so desires, carrying out the placement jointly. See section C55.3 below for more detail.

C15.4.2 Law 15.8 recommends that after placing a ball on the *yard-line* near another ball, the *striker* should advise the opponent whether the balls are in contact or close together but not touching. This helps to avoid situations where the striker places the ball in one position (in or out of contact with the other ball) but one or both balls move so that they are in different relative positions when the opponent comes on to play, causing the new striker to play a different *stroke* (*croquet stroke* rather than *roquet* or vice versa) from the one the previous striker was expecting.

C15.5 ADJUDICATING CLOSE POSITIONS On occasion, a judgement has to be made as to whether a ball to be placed on the *yard-line* must be placed in or out of contact with one or more other balls already on the yard-line or close to it. If the most accurate test that can be done (using a set square if available) of where the ball must be placed concludes that its position is borderline between being in or out of contact with the other ball (or one of them), the borderline case ruling is that the ball must be placed not in contact with the other ball or any of them (Law 15.9). Should one side or the other involve the placed ball in the next *stroke*, that stroke is a *roquet* (or rush), not a *croquet stroke*.

C16 WIRING LIFT

C16.1 WIRING LIFT

C16.1.1 At the start of a turn, if the *striker* chooses to play a ball:

C16.1.1.1 that is not in contact with another ball but is wired from all other balls, as defined in Law 16.3; and

C16.1.1.2 the opponent is responsible for the ball's position, as defined in Law 16.2, the striker may lift the ball and play it from either *baulk-line* instead of from where it lies.

C16.1.2 A ball within the *jaws of a hoop* meets the criteria for being wired from all other balls set out in Law 16.3, but if it is in contact with another ball and the *striker* chooses to play it, the striker must *take croquet* immediately and is not entitled to a wiring lift. (Laws 16.1 and 18.1.3.1.)

C16.1.3 Although a ball lifted must usually be played from a *baulk-line*, the *striker* can *take croquet* from a ball that the lifted ball could touch if placed on a *baulk-line* (Law 16.1.2), in which case the striker can place the lifted ball anywhere in contact with the other ball to take croquet.

C16.1.4 If the *striker* can create a *group of balls* by placing the lifted ball on the *baulk-line* in contact with another ball, the striker may *take croquet* immediately only from a ball in the group that the lifted ball can contact when it is placed on the *baulk-line* (Law 16.1.2).

C16.1.4.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy is entitled to a wiring lift for R when K is on the first *corner spot* and B is in contact with K on the west *boundary*. Roy may play a *cannon*, *taking croquet* immediately from K and with B as the third ball, but may not play the cannon by taking croquet from B, because R cannot contact B when placed on the *baulk-line*.

C16.2 RESPONSIBILITY FOR POSITION

C16.2.1 The 7th Edition Laws change the way responsibility for a ball's position is specified (in Laws 16.2.1 and 16.2.2). This does not make any difference in practice; its aim is to clarify the law. The general law specifies that the position of a ball is the responsibility of the player who most recently played:

C16.2.1.1 a *stroke* with it as the *striker's ball* (which includes playing it as the *wrong ball*) (Law 16.2.1.1); or

C16.2.1.2 a *stroke* that moved or shook that ball (including a *croquet stroke* in which that ball was the croqueted ball or the third or fourth balls of a *cannon* and a *single-ball stroke* in which that ball was *roqueted* or otherwise moved or shaken) (Law 16.2.1.2); or

C16.2.1.3 a *croquet stroke* or *cannon* involving that ball, even if it did not move in that *stroke* (Law 16.2.1.3).

C16.2.2 There are also two special cases (Law 16.2.2).

C16.2.2.1 A player who begins a turn by striking an opponent's ball is thereby responsible not only for the position of that ball (under Law 16.2.1.1) but also for the positions of both balls of the player's side (under Law 16.2.2.1); and

C16.2.2.2 A player who starts a turn by declaring a *stroke* to have been played and identifies to which ball the declaration applies is responsible for the position of that ball. If the player fails to specify to which ball of the side the declaration applies, however, the player is thereby responsible for the positions of both of them.

C16.2.3 The general law, Law 16.2.1, applies to *strokes* played in error even if *rectification* results in balls being replaced in the positions they lawfully occupied before the *error* (Law 16.2.3).

C16.2.3.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy plays R and *roquets* B but then *takes croquet* from K, which is *live*. The *error* is claimed and *rectified*, which results in K being replaced. Roy is now responsible for the position of K by virtue of the error of using it in an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a live ball. Roy is also responsible for the position of B.

C16.2.4 Law 16.2.3 usually applies to *strokes* played in error by the *striker* but may also apply to the opponent. If the player who is not the striker plays when not entitled (an *error* under Law 26) that player becomes responsible for the positions of one or more balls by playing *strokes in error*.

C16.2.5 If an *interference* under Laws 31 to 33 has to be *redressed*, the game is returned to the situation when the interference first affected play, and responsibility for the position of each ball reverts to what it was at that time (Laws 16.2.4 and 30.3.1.5). There will be times when a long period of play is cancelled to redress such an interference and it may be difficult to ascertain responsibility for the positions of the balls at the point to which play reverts.

C16.2.6 If an *interference* under Laws 34 to 38 is remedied, the responsibility for the position of any ball placed or replaced as part of that remedy reverts to what it was immediately before the ball was affected by the interference (Laws 16.2.4 and 30.3.3).

C16.2.7 The following examples illustrate other implications of Laws 16.2.4 and 30.3.

C16.2.7.1 **EXAMPLE** If the *striker* plays a roll stroke in which the croqueted ball collides with a ball from a *double-banked game*, it must be placed where it would otherwise have come to rest under Law 34.2.2. The act of playing the *stroke* caused the striker to become responsible for the croqueted ball's final position (Law 16.2.1.2), and the subsequent *interference* and placement does not alter that.

C16.2.7.2 **EXAMPLE** If a high wind (or even the *striker*, outside the *striking period*) causes a ball not otherwise involved in the *stroke* to move, it must be replaced (Law 36.2.1). Again, the *interference* does not change responsibility: whichever player was responsible for the position of the ball before the interference remains so afterwards.

C16.3 **WHEN WIRED** Under Law 16.3.2, the relevant ball is wired from a target ball if it has to pass through a hoop to hit the target ball, no matter how close to the hoop the relevant ball may be. It does not matter that it might be able to miss the target ball on either side without touching a wire on its way through the hoop. This is a change of terminology from the 6th Edition of the Laws without a change in substance. The 6th Edition made the same point by specifying that wiring occurred if any part of a hoop, including the *jaws*, impeded the direct course of the relevant ball towards any part of the target.

C16.4 **IMPEDED SWING** If the *striker* claims that a ball is wired by virtue of an impeded swing, the referee must test the position with the mallet the claimant last used before the allegedly wired ball was positioned by the claimant's opponent (Laws 16.4.1 and 16.4.2). This removes the temptation to carry a second, wide-faced mallet for use only in these situations. Self-evidently, this applies only if the mallet the striker was using at that earlier time is still available, not having been rendered unusable in the meantime.

C16.5 TESTING

- C16.5.1 Law 16.5 requires the *striker* either to ask a referee to adjudicate or to consult the opponent in accordance with Law 55.3 when claiming a wiring lift. It is normal practice to get a referee to adjudicate, but if no referee or other independent and competent person is available, the players may test the position jointly. See section C55.3 below on the requirement to consult.
- C16.5.2 Only the *striker* about to play the first *stroke* of a turn may ask for a test for wiring to be conducted, and the test may be conducted only if the opponent is responsible for the position of the ball for which the striker is claiming the lift (Law 16.5.2). These are matters a referee must check before carrying out a wiring test. A player who wants to determine whether a ball is wired at any other time must rely on a visual test and must not waste time by undertaking such a test in a protracted manner (see Law 56.4).
- C16.5.3 Requesting a wiring test does not commit the *striker* to playing the relevant ball in that turn. The partner ball may, for example, be played to a position on or near a *baulk-line* that is wired from the relevant ball, in the hope of still being entitled to a lift in a subsequent turn.
- C16.5.4 **ADJUDICATING CLOSE POSITIONS** Law 16.5.3 covers the borderline case where a test of any cause of wiring concludes that the situation is too close to call. The decision must be that the relevant ball is wired from the target ball due to that cause. This is an identical ruling to that in the 6th Edition of the Laws.

C16.6 CHANGE OF DECISION

- C16.6.1 Law 16.6.1 defines the consequences of lifting a ball when entitled to under Law 16.1.2:
- C16.6.1.1 lifting it constitutes a valid and irrevocable choice of the *striker's ball* for that turn under Law 12.2.2.1; and
 - C16.6.1.2 the *striker* must play the lifted ball as described in paragraphs C16.1.3 and C16.1.4 above; and
 - C16.6.1.3 the *striker* may not play the lifted ball from where it originally lay unless that happened to be on a *baulk-line*.
- C16.6.2 Nevertheless, the *striker* remains free to change the position on the *baulk-lines* from which the *striker's ball* is played until the first *stroke* of the turn is played (Law 16.6.2).

C17 ROQUET

C17.1 WHEN A ROQUET IS MADE

- C17.1.1 Law 17.1 is phrased deliberately widely, defining a *roquet* as any contact that occurs between the *striker's ball* and a *live ball* during a *stroke* as a consequence of that stroke, except in the special situations defined in Law 17.2. Thus, for example, a roquet is made if:
- C17.1.1.1 the *striker's ball* hits a *live ball* directly; or
 - C17.1.1.2 the *striker's ball* bounces off a hoop (or the peg, if not pegged out, or a *dead ball*) and hits a *live ball*; or
 - C17.1.1.3 the *striker's ball* croquets a ball into a *live ball*, propelling it into the path of the *striker's ball* (a less probable extension of C17.1.1.1 above); or
 - C17.1.1.4 the *striker's ball* croquets a ball into a *live ball* which then rebounds off a hoop and hits the *striker's ball* (a low probability event).
- C17.1.2 By contrast, if the *striker's ball* runs its *hoop in order* off the court and when placed on the *yard-line* is in contact with another ball, this does not count as a *roquet* as the contact does not occur during the *stroke*. In such a situation the *striker takes croquet* immediately in accordance with Law 18.1.2. Similar instances where the *striker's ball* is in contact with a *live ball* during a turn without having roqueted that ball are treated in the same way under

Law 18.1.2. These reflect the changed approach to the way the Laws describe the sequence of strokes in a game, as outlined in paragraph C2.2.4 above.

C17.2 LIMITATIONS The situations covered in Law 17.2 are as follows.

- C17.2.1 The *striker's ball* roquets a *live ball* and rebounds onto a different live ball. Only the hit on the first live ball counts as a roquet (Law 17.2.1).
- C17.2.2 The *striker's ball* hits two or more *live balls* simultaneously. A *roquet* is made only on whichever of those balls the *striker takes croquet* from (Law 17.2.2).
- C17.2.3 The *striker's ball* simultaneously hits a *live ball* and the peg in order. The peg point is scored unless the *striker* claims the *roquet* by *taking croquet* from the live ball (Laws 17.2.3 and 22.2.2).
- C17.2.4 The *striker's ball* hits a *live ball* during a *croquet stroke* (Law 17.2.4). Usually the *striker* will be required to *take croquet* from that live ball in the next stroke. That is not the case, however, when the live ball was the ball from which the *striker* took croquet and the *striker's ball* ran its *hoop in order*, causing the croqueted ball to become live again, before hitting it (Law 21.4.2). This is most likely when the *stroke* is an Irish peel and the *striker's ball* catches up with and hits the croqueted ball on the other side of the hoop (see section C21.8 below).

C17.3 CONSEQUENCES OF A ROQUET Certain consequences are spelled out in Law 17.3.

- C17.3.1 The *striker's ball* may cause other balls to move and score points during a *stroke* after it has made a *roquet* in that stroke. The *striker* may pick up or stop the *striker's ball* before it comes to rest only if doing so will not prevent it from moving other balls (Law 17.3.1).
- C17.3.2 The *striker's ball* can score a *hoop point* for itself subsequently in the same *stroke* only in the circumstances specified in Law 21.2 (Law 17.3.2).
- C17.3.3 The *striker's ball* cannot subsequently score a peg point during the *stroke* (Law 17.3.3).
- C17.3.4 Following a *roquet*, the *striker* is required to continue the turn by *taking croquet* from the ball roqueted unless a turn-ending event, as listed in Law 7.6, has occurred (Law 17.3.4). If so, the *striker's ball* does not become in hand and its lawful position is the one in which it came to rest (or would have done, if not picked up or arrested).

C18 CROQUET STROKE

C18.1 REQUIREMENT TO TAKE CROQUET This law reflects the changed way the 7th Edition of the Laws describes the conduct of the game, as outlined in paragraph C2.2.4 above. Law 18.1 specifies the circumstances in which the *striker*, being entitled to play a *stroke*, must *take croquet*:

- C18.1.1 when a *roquet* was made in the previous *stroke* (Law 18.1.1); or
- C18.1.2 when the *striker's ball* is otherwise lawfully in contact with a *live ball* during a turn (for example, after running its *hoop in order* off the court and when placed on the *yard-line* being in contact with the live ball) (Law 18.1.2); or
- C18.1.3 at the start of a turn when the ball the *striker* chooses as the *striker's ball* is lawfully in contact with another ball (Law 18.1.3.1); or
- C18.1.4 at the start of a turn when the ball the *striker* chooses as the *striker's ball* by lifting it under Laws 16 (wiring lift) or 39 (advanced play) or 40 (super-advanced play) may be and finally is placed in contact with another ball before the first *stroke* (Law 18.1.3.2); or
- C18.1.5 at the start of the second, third or fourth turns of the game when the ball the *striker* plays into the game may be and finally is placed in contact with another ball before the first *stroke* (Law 18.1.3.2).

C18.2 CHOICE OF THE BALL FROM WHICH CROQUET IS TAKEN Law 18.2 specifies the options open to the *striker* for choosing the ball from which croquet is taken.

- C18.2.1 When the *striker's ball* has made a *roquet*, the *striker* must *take croquet* from the ball roqueted (Law 18.2.1).
- C18.2.2 When the *striker* is required to *take croquet* either at the start of a turn or during a turn because the *striker's ball* is lawfully in contact with a *live ball* but they do not form part of a *group*, the *striker* must *take croquet* from that live ball (Law 18.2.2).
- C18.2.3 Subject to the exceptions described in paragraphs C18.2.4 and C18.2.5 below, when the *striker* is required to *take croquet* either at the start of or during a turn because the *striker's ball* is lawfully in contact with a *live ball* and they are part of a *group*, the *striker* may take croquet from any live ball in the group. See the example in paragraph C18.2.8.1 below (Law 18.2.3).
- C18.2.4 When the *striker* has created a *group of balls* by *roqueting* one of them, the *striker* must *take croquet* from the ball roqueted – circumstances covered by paragraph C18.2.1 above. See also the example in paragraph C18.2.8.2 below.
- C18.2.5 If the *striker* can create a *group of balls* by placing the *striker's ball* on the *baulk-line* in contact with another ball when:
- C18.2.5.1 playing the *striker's ball* into the game in accordance with Law 11.2.2.1; or
 - C18.2.5.2 taking a wiring lift in accordance with Law 16.1.2; or
 - C18.2.5.3 taking an advanced play lift or super-advanced play lift in accordance with Laws 39.3.2 and 40.3.2 respectively
- the *striker* must *take croquet* from a ball the *striker's ball* can contact when it is placed on the *baulk-line*. See the examples in paragraphs C18.2.8.3 and C18.2.8.4 below. (Law 18.2.3)
- C18.2.6 In the circumstances described in paragraphs C18.2.3 and C18.2.5, when the *striker* has a choice of balls from which croquet may lawfully be taken, the croqueted ball is determined by playing the *croquet stroke*. Merely moving the balls in preparation for the *stroke* does not determine the choice and the *striker* may change the decision about which *live ball* is to be the croqueted ball up to the point when the stroke is played (Law 18.2.3).
- C18.2.7 In all of these situations, if the *striker* fails to *take croquet* correctly, an *error* covered by one of Laws 28.4, 28.5 and 28.6 is committed (see Law 18.2.4).

C18.2.8 **EXAMPLES**

- C18.2.8.1 At the start of Bab's turn, B, K and Y form a *3-ball group*. Bab may play either B or K and, in the *cannon*, may *take croquet* from either of the other two balls. The choice of the *striker's ball* for the turn and the ball from which croquet is taken are both determined only when Bab plays the *cannon*.
- C18.2.8.2 Roy plays R and *roquets* B off the court so that when it is placed on the *yard-line* it is in contact with K. Roy must play a *cannon* with B as the ball from which croquet is taken. *Taking croquet* from K in the *cannon* would be an *error* covered by Laws 28.4 or 28.5 depending on the *live/dead* status of K.
- C18.2.8.3 Roy is entitled to a wiring lift for R when B and K are in contact with each other in the centre of A-baulk. Roy can create a *3-ball group* by placing R on the *baulk-line* in contact with B on one side or with K on the other side. Roy may begin the turn by playing a *cannon*, *taking croquet* from either B or K.
- C18.2.8.4 Bab is entitled to an advanced play lift when R is on the *corner spot* of Corner I and Y is in contact with R on the west *yard-line*. Bab lifts B and can create a *3-ball group* by placing B in contact with R on the *baulk-line*. She may begin the turn by playing a *cannon*, *taking croquet* from R with Y as the third ball. She may not begin the turn by playing a *cannon* with Y as the ball from which croquet is taken, however, because B cannot contact Y when placed on the *baulk-line*. Doing so would be an *error* covered by Law 28.5.

C18.3 PLACING BALLS FOR THE CROQUET STROKE The requirement in Laws 18.3 and 18.4 that balls must be placed on the ground was introduced many years ago. A leading Australian player had rushed a ball into hoop 1 when the only remaining *live ball* was near hoop 2. Nothing daunted, he carefully balanced the *striker's ball* on top of the roqueted ball and played it from there. The authorities took a dim view of such ingenuity.

C18.4 CANNONS

- C18.4.1 A *cannon* (see Law 18.4) depends on the existence of a *group of balls* anywhere on the court. Usually, at least one of them will be on the *yard-line*, but this is not a requirement.
- C18.4.2 The *striker's ball* cannot create a *group* by bridging the gap between two separated balls that are a ball's diameter or less apart. This is because Law 18.3 requires the striker's ball to be placed in contact with the ball from which it is about to *take croquet* and no other.
- C18.4.3 The moveable third ball in a *group* cannot be used to bridge a gap to create a *4-ball cannon* when there is a *3-ball group* with a fourth ball close, but not in contact with it. The third ball can legally be placed where it also contacts the fourth ball when constructing the 3-ball cannon, but a *4-ball group* does not result. Law 18.4 refers only to placing the *striker's ball* before determining the size of the group. In the situation described, the fourth ball may not be moved before the cannon is played, though it may be moved by the cannon.
- C18.4.4 Law 18.4 sets out the correct procedure for preparing and playing a *cannon*. The ball from which croquet will be taken must be in the position it occupied before the *stroke*, and if it has been moved it must be replaced. The *striker's ball* and the third ball must not be in contact with each other when the cannon is played. If they are, the *striker* commits the *error* of playing an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving the third ball. Usually it will be *live*, Law 28.5 will apply and the striker will be required to *replay* correctly provided no turn-ending event occurred in the unlawful stroke. (See paragraph C28.6.3 below and the example following it for a more detailed consideration of this situation.) But should the third ball be *dead*, the turn ends under Law 28.4. The same applies in a 4-ball cannon, although there is nothing to stop the striker placing the fourth ball in contact with both the ball from which croquet is being taken and the third ball. Normally, the fourth ball is placed in contact with the third ball so that it will travel towards the next hoop when the stroke is played.
- C18.4.5 If the *striker* creates a *cannon* in which the third ball is *dead*, the *stroke* should be watched by a referee. With most placements of the balls, there is a risk of the striker hitting the *striker's ball* a second time, or maintaining contact with it, after it has hit the dead ball. That would be a fault, since the contact with the dead ball is not a *roquet* (see the discussion at section C29.12 below). With some arrangements, such a fault would be unavoidable. If the striker does not call a referee, the opponent has, and should exercise, the right to do so.
- C18.4.6 Occasionally, the *striker* may *roquet a live ball* so that it stops infield very close to a third ball. (See paragraph C15.5 above for situations where the live ball stops or goes off the court in a position where it has to be placed on the *yard-line* very close to or touching a third ball.) It may be difficult to judge whether or not the live ball and the third ball are in contact (and therefore whether the striker has a *cannon*). The only suitable test to apply is to get someone to hold a sheet of paper or card (white unless one of the balls is white) on one side of the balls and then sight horizontally from the other side to see whether any of the coloured paper is visible at the narrowest part of the gap between the balls. If no colour is visible, the striker has a cannon. Under no circumstances should an attempt be made to place anything underneath the balls or between them in an effort to test whether there is a gap.

C18.5 LIVE AND DEAD STATUS OF THE BALLS A *live ball* becomes *dead* only when croquet is taken from it (Law 18.6 and the definition of live and dead balls in the glossary). It is incorrect (but a common misconception) that a ball becomes dead when it is *roqueted*. A consequence of the correct interpretation is that if the *striker* roquets a live ball, but then plays an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving

a different live ball, the ball roqueted remains live while the ball from which croquet is unlawfully taken becomes dead. If the *error* is *discovered* within its *limit of claims* and the striker is entitled to resume the turn, the ball from which croquet was unlawfully taken becomes live again and the ball originally roqueted will become dead when croquet is taken from it. If the error is not discovered within its limit of claims, the live status of the ball originally roqueted will not have been changed as a consequence of the roquet and the following unlawful croquet stroke. (It may have been changed by subsequent *strokes*.)

C18.6 PLAYING A CROQUET STROKE WHEN NOT INTENDING TO DO SO There are rare occasions when the *striker* is required to *take croquet*, as specified in Laws 18.1.2 (*striker's ball* lawfully in contact with a *live ball* during a turn) or 18.1.3 (*striker's ball* lawfully in contact with a live ball at the start of a turn) but the striker mistakenly believes it is permissible to do something else, usually to *roquet* another ball instead, and proceeds to do so. Law 28 (playing when a ball is *misplaced*) does not apply, as the striker has played with all balls in their lawful positions. Regardless of what the striker intends, the *stroke* must be treated as a *croquet stroke* and the laws applied accordingly. In particular it is a fault if the croqueted ball does not move or shake in that first stroke or if the striker does not play into the croqueted ball, and the turn ends if it goes off the court.

C18.6.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy starts a turn with R and Y in contact and B nearby at right angles to them. Roy decides to play R and would like to make his first hoop off Y, so he plays a *stroke* to *roquet* B without moving or shaking Y. As he is preparing to *take croquet* from B to get a rush on Y, Bab stops play and queries what happened. Roy's first stroke was a *croquet stroke* even though he thought of it only as a roquet on B. As a result, he committed a fault by failing to move or shake Y. The situation described here should be contrasted with that described in paragraph C28.3.3. In that case, the *striker* attempts to play a rush with the two balls a very small distance apart, but when the stroke is played the balls have moved into contact. That stroke is still treated as a roquet; the balls are *misplaced* and Law 28.3 applies.

C19 CONTINUATION STROKE

No comment required.

C20 HOOP POINT

C20.1 RUNNING A HOOP

C20.1.1 A ball may lawfully pass through any hoop on the court, but it is only by passing through its *hoop in order*, in the correct direction, that the ball scores a *hoop point*. The Laws refer to the ball passing through its hoop in order as "running its hoop in order", sometimes abbreviated to just "running". The term "running a hoop" is not used in the Laws to describe the ball passing through any other hoop.

C20.1.2 The 7th Edition makes a distinction between a ball running its *hoop in order* and scoring the *hoop point*. During a *stroke*, a ball begins to run its hoop in order as soon as the front of it protrudes on the *non-playing side* of the hoop (see Law 20.1 and the second illustration in Diagram 3). Having done so, if it subsequently moves back through the hoop to a point where there is no longer any part of it protruding on the non-playing side, or if it exits the hoop entirely on the *playing side*, then it has no longer begun to run the hoop.

C20.1.3 A ball completes running its *hoop in order* during a *stroke* as soon as no part of it protrudes on the *playing side* of the hoop, that is to say the side from which it started the running (see the fourth illustration in Diagram 3), unless it subsequently moves back through the hoop to a point where part of it protrudes on the playing side or it exits the hoop entirely on the playing side, in which case it has not completed the running (Law 20.2).

C20.2 BALL BECOMING A BALL IN HAND WHILE RUNNING ITS HOOP IN ORDER

C20.2.1 Note carefully the implications of Law 20.2.2.1 for the situation where the *striker's ball* (or more rarely the third or fourth ball in a *cannon*) is part-way through running its *hoop in order* at the beginning of a *croquet stroke*. The ball becomes a *ball in hand* in preparation

for the croquet stroke and Law 20.2.2 requires that it must begin to run the hoop again before it can thereafter complete running the hoop and score the *hoop point*. Law 20.2.2.1 is carefully phrased to prevent the *striker* from getting around this requirement by playing the croquet stroke without adjusting the position of the ball.

- C20.2.2 If a ball part-way through running its *hoop in order* becomes in hand for other reasons, namely temporary removal under Law 5.3.2 (to be wiped, avoid interference, or be exchanged if faulty), or (less obviously) to be replaced to *rectify* an *error* or remedy an *interference* as specified in Law 9.2.1.4, it can complete the running from the position in which it is replaced. Law 20.2.2.1 refers only to a ball becoming in hand in preparation for a *croquet stroke*.
- C20.2.3 Law 20.2.2.2 makes the more obvious point that if a ball is part-way through running its *hoop in order* when it is lifted under Laws 16 (wiring lift) or 39 (advanced play) or 40 (super-advanced play) then it must begin to run the hoop again.

C20.3 SCORING A HOOP POINT

- C20.3.1 A ball can score a *hoop point* only during a *stroke* in which it completes running its *hoop in order* and it does so when it:
- C20.3.1.1 comes to rest where no part of it protrudes out of the hoop on the *playing side*; or
 - C20.3.1.2 crosses the court *boundary*; or
 - C20.3.1.3 enters the *jaws* of the next hoop in the order specified in Law 2.4 and illustrated in Diagram 1.

This makes two points explicit: a ball scores a *hoop point* by running it off the court and it may score two hoops in one *stroke*. These seemingly obvious points were sometimes disputed on the basis of the definition of scoring a hoop point in the 6th Edition of the Laws.

C20.4 SPECIAL SITUATIONS: BALL ENTERING THE BACK OF A HOOP

- C20.4.1 Law 20.4.1 specifies that if a ball enters its *hoop in order* from the *non-playing side*, it cannot score the *hoop point* in that *stroke*. This applies even if it reaches a point on the *playing side* where it is visibly clear of the *jaws* before returning through the hoop and coming to rest in a position where it has apparently completed running the hoop. The governing principles are that dynamic situations are too difficult to judge reliably and that all such situations should be treated alike.
- C20.4.2 If a ball enters its *hoop in order* from the *non-playing side* and comes to rest within the *jaws* but in a position where it does not protrude out of the hoop on the non-playing side (see the first illustration in Diagram 3 in the Laws) then it can score the *hoop point* from there in a subsequent *stroke* (Law 20.4.1). This is because the ball has not begun to run the hoop in the position in which it has come to rest.

C20.5 SPECIAL SITUATIONS: BALL PLACED IN A HOOP (Law 20.4.2)

- C20.5.1 If the *striker roquets* a ball into the *jaws* of the *hoop in order* for the *striker's ball*, and when the *striker's ball* is placed for the *croquet stroke* it is within the jaws but does not protrude out on the *non-playing side*, the *striker's ball* can run the hoop to score the *hoop point* in the croquet stroke or a subsequent *stroke*. This is analogous to the situation in paragraph C20.4.2 above.
- C20.5.2 Contrast this with the situation where the *striker's ball* protrudes out of the *jaws* on the *non-playing side* when placed for the *croquet stroke*. By being placed in this position, the *striker's ball* has not begun to run the hoop (see Law 20.4.2 and the definition of when a ball begins to run a hoop in Law 20.1). It cannot run the hoop to score the *hoop point* from that position. Furthermore, the *striker's ball* can begin to run the hoop in a subsequent stroke only if it comes to rest in a position in which it does not protrude out of the hoop on the non-playing side. In some positions this can be achieved by bouncing the *striker's ball* off the hoop upright in the croquet stroke.

C20.6 BALL FALLING BACK

C20.6.1 A depression or “rabbit run” often develops in the ground between the uprights of a hoop, so that a ball clears the *playing side*, or even the *jaws* entirely, but then falls back to end the *stroke* protruding from the hoop on the playing side. If so, it has not run the hoop. That is the case even if it hits a ball that was some distance behind the hoop. If the ball it hit was *live*, a *roquet* will have been made but the hoop is not scored.

C20.7 CONSULTING A REFEREE OR THE OPPONENT (Law 20.5)

C20.7.1 Before testing whether a ball has scored a *hoop point* or is in a position to do so, the *striker* must consult as required by Law 55.3 by either calling a referee to adjudicate or consulting the opponent and, if the opponent so desires, testing the position jointly with the opponent. See section C55.3 below for more detail on the striker’s obligation to consult.

C20.8 ADJUDICATING CLOSE POSITIONS (Law 20.6)

C20.8.1 If a test of whether a ball has scored its *hoop in order* shows that the ball is on the borderline between protruding out of the hoop on the *playing side* and not doing so, the decision is that the ball has scored the *hoop point* (Law 20.6.1). The borderline position is where the back of the ball exactly touches, but does not break, the vertical surface of the *jaws* on the playing side of the hoop. Note carefully that this ruling in the 7th Edition reverses the ruling that applied in the 6th Edition, which required the ball to be clear of that surface on the playing side. While this is an important change of principle, the instances when it will make any practical difference will be rare. The change was made to make the law consistent with what could practically be observed.

C20.8.2 The test that should be used to determine whether a *ball at rest* has scored its *hoop in order* is to sight across the *playing side* of the hoop on the surface defined by the two hoop uprights and see whether any part of the ball is visible protruding out of the hoop. If no part of the ball can be seen protruding out of the hoop on that side, the ball has scored the *hoop point*.

C20.8.3 Likewise, if there is a borderline result to a test of whether a *ball at rest* or placed within the *jaws* of its *hoop in order* can run the hoop and score the *hoop point* from that position, the decision is that it can do so (Law 20.6.2). This also reverses the ruling that applied in the 6th Edition, but the instances when it will make any practical difference will be rare.

C21 STRIKER’S BALL RUNNING ITS HOOP AND HITTING ANOTHER BALL

C21.1 This law covers all cases where the *striker’s ball* hits a ball in the same *stroke* as it runs its *hoop in order*. Completing the running, defined in Law 20.2.1, requires that the striker’s ball not only leaves the *playing side* of the hoop but does not re-enter it and remain there when it comes to rest. Thus Law 21 does not cover a case in which the striker’s ball passes through its hoop, hits a ball, and then rolls back into a position where it has not completed the running (see paragraph C20.6.1 above for that case).

C21.2 **ROQUET MADE BEFORE BALL STARTS TO RUN HOOP** (Law 21.3.1) When the *striker’s ball* makes a *roquet* and then enters and passes through its *hoop in order*, the roquet is made but the *hoop point* is not scored regardless of where the striker’s ball comes to rest.

C21.3 Providing the *striker’s ball* does complete the running, there are five other situations (when there is only one other relevant ball).

C21.4 **HOOP SCORED AND ROQUET MADE** (Law 21.2): other ball well behind the hoop

C21.4.1 If the *striker’s ball* completes the running of its hoop (see Law 20.2.1) and then hits the other ball, the *hoop point* is scored and the *roquet* made under Law 21.2. It does not matter whether the other ball was 6 inches beyond the hoop or 25 yards beyond.

C21.5 HOOP SCORED AND ROQUET MADE (Law 21.2): other ball just behind the hoop

- C21.5.1 If the *striker's ball* begins to run the hoop, then hits a ball that was clear of the *non-playing side* before the start of the *stroke*, and then completes the running, strict logic would demand that a *roquet* was made, but no *hoop point* was scored, if the other ball was *live* before the stroke started.
- C21.5.2 This physical situation, however, conceals a difficult marginal case, namely where the other ball is just less than a ball's diameter beyond the hoop on the *non-playing side* and the hoop stroke is played with jump. How can a referee decide whether the back of the *striker's ball* no longer protruded out of the hoop on the *playing side* when the striker's ball made its first contact with the other ball? Did the striker's ball complete running its *hoop in order* before or after it hit the other ball?
- C21.5.3 To avoid presenting referees with such a difficult dynamic question, the policy of the law is to simplify matters in favour of the *striker*. Provided the other ball is clear of the hoop on the *non-playing side* before the *stroke* starts (a static question that can be determined before the stroke is played) and the *striker's ball* completes the running (a static question that can be determined after the stroke has ended), the contact between the two balls is deemed to occur after the running of the hoop has been completed. The analysis is deemed to be identical to paragraph C21.4.1 above: the *hoop point* is scored and the *roquet* is made.

C21.6 ROQUET MADE AND HOOP NOT SCORED (Law 21.3.2): *live* other ball in the *jaws*

- C21.6.1 If the other ball is *live* and protruding into the *jaws* of the hoop, i.e. not clear of the hoop on the *non-playing side*, when the *stroke* starts, the *striker* may wish to jump it to score the *hoop point*. This presents the same dynamic question as detailed in paragraph C21.5.2 above, namely whether the first contact between the two balls occurred before or after the *striker's ball* completed the running. If the first contact occurs before the striker's ball completes the running and the other ball is *live*, the analysis would be *roquet* and no hoop. If the first contact occurs afterwards, the analysis would be hoop followed by roquet as in paragraph C21.4.1 above. How is a referee able to distinguish the sequence of events?
- C21.6.2 The policy of the law is again to simplify matters (but this time not in favour of the *striker*) by deeming that all such contacts with a *live ball* that is not clear of the *jaws*, irrespective of when they occur, are treated as *roquet* and no hoop (Law 21.3.2).

C21.7 HOOP SCORED AND ROQUET NOT MADE (Law 21.4.1): *dead* other ball in the *jaws*

- C21.7.1 If the other ball is *dead* in the situation described in section C21.6 above, a similar issue arises: if the *striker's ball* contacts the dead ball during a jump shot, does it do so before or after completing the running? The policy adopted is again to simplify matters by deeming that all contacts during the *stroke* with a dead ball in the *jaws* are ignored so that the analysis is hoop and no *roquet* (Law 21.4.1).
- C21.7.2 This gives the *striker* a tactical bonus when trying to complete a straight hoop 12 (*rover peel*). If the *peelee* sticks in the hoop, the striker can half-jump it in the knowledge that any subsequent contacts between the *striker's ball* and the *peelee*, which happen quite often, do not count as *roquets* and hence will not impede the chances of pegging out the *peelee*.
- C21.7.3 The only exception is when the *striker's ball* and the other ball come to rest in contact with each other, in which case the *striker* is required to *take croquet* immediately in accordance with Law 18.1.2.

C21.8 HOOP SCORED AND ROQUET NOT MADE (Law 21.4.2): Irish peel

- C21.8.1 The last situation is the Irish peel. Here the *striker* plays a *croquet stroke* in which both the *striker's ball* and the croqueted ball are sent through the hoop in the same *stroke*. The croqueted ball is treated in the same way as a *dead* other ball (see section C21.7 above) and no later contacts between the two balls in the stroke count as a *roquet* (Law 21.4.2).

- C21.8.2 The same exception as in paragraph C21.7.3 above applies if the two balls come to rest in contact: Law 18.1.2 requires the *striker* to *take croquet* immediately.
- C21.8.3 The same analysis applies in the infrequent case of a *continuation stroke* played with the *striker's ball* and the other ball in contact. This usually occurs after a failed Irish peel when the *striker* has had the good fortune to have the *striker's ball* end up in contact with the croqueted ball and with the centres of the balls aligned so that another Irish peel can be played that will send the *striker's ball* through the hoop. In such cases the *striker* must not make the fatal *error* of adjusting the *striker's ball* in contact with the croqueted ball (which is now a *dead ball*) before playing the continuation stroke as this makes it an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball*, penalised by end of turn under Law 28.4.

C21.9 MORE THAN ONE OTHER BALL

- C21.9.1 If the *striker's ball* hits more than one other ball in a *stroke* when, before the stroke, one of them was *live* and not clear of the hoop on the *non-playing side* and the other was clear on the *non-playing side* (and therefore necessarily further away), the hit on the ball that was not clear (i.e. closer to the *striker's ball*) governs what happens. The applicable Law is 21.3.2: the *roquet* is made and the hoop is not scored.
- C21.9.2 If both other balls were clear of the hoop on the *non-playing side* before the *stroke*, then the ball *roqueted* is determined by Laws 17.2.1 and 17.2.2 (whichever was first hit, or whichever the *striker* chooses if they were hit simultaneously).

C21.10 ADJUDICATING CLOSE POSITIONS

- C21.10.1 When the *striker's ball* is about to run its *hoop in order* and there is another ball on the *non-playing side*, the position of which is tested (see paragraph C21.10.2) and found to be on the borderline between being in the *jaws* and clear of the jaws, the decision is that the other ball is in the jaws (see Law 21.5). This means that the *striker* cannot make hoop and roquet in the same *stroke*.
- C21.10.1.1 If the other ball is *live*, then if there is any contact between the balls a *roquet* is made and the *hoop point* is not scored (see Law 21.5.2).
- C21.10.1.2 If the other ball is *dead* and the *striker's ball* runs the hoop in the *stroke*, Law 21.4 applies (see Law 21.5.3). The *hoop point* is scored and a *roquet* is not made, but the *striker* is required to *take croquet* immediately if the balls come to rest in contact.
- C21.10.2 The test that should be used to determine whether a ball outside the *jaws* does or does not protrude into the jaws is to sight across the *non-playing side* of the hoop on the surface defined by the two hoop uprights and see whether any gap is visible between the surface of the uprights and the ball. If no gap is visible, the ball protrudes into the jaws.
- C21.10.3 This borderline case ruling is consistent with that which applied under the 6th Edition.
- C21.10.4 Note that the 7th Edition borderline case rulings on whether a ball has or has not scored its *hoop in order* and whether a ball within the *jaws* of a hoop does or does not protrude out of the hoop (Law 20.6) are logically consistent with the ruling on whether a ball outside the jaws of a hoop does or does not protrude into the hoop (Law 21.5). This was not the case with the equivalent parts of the 6th Edition Laws.

C22 PEG POINT

C22.1 Note the meaning of the traditional term *rover ball*, which is a ball that has scored all of its *hoop points* and is thus for the peg; the term does not mean a ball that is for hoop 12 (or rover, as it has traditionally been known).

C22.2 **HOW A PEG POINT IS SCORED** If the *striker's ball* is a *rover ball*, it may cause another rover ball to be pegged out either directly or through the agency of another ball (see Law 22.1.2). The same principle applies in Law 22.2.4, which covers cases where the other rover ball is in contact with the peg at the start of the *stroke*. If the *striker's ball* is not a rover ball, however, and it causes a rover ball to hit the peg or to hit another rover ball onto the peg, that ball is not pegged out in either situation.

C22.3 BALL REMAINING IN PLAY

- C22.3.1 A ball that is pegged out does not disappear at the moment of pegging out. It remains a *ball in play* until the end of that *stroke* (see the glossary definition of a ball in play and Law 22.3.1). It may cause other balls to move, be *roqueted* and score points as a consequence of that stroke and, if it is not the *striker's ball*, may cause the striker's ball to make a roquet.
- C22.3.2 Note, however, that a ball other than the *striker's ball* becomes *dead* immediately it hits the peg in the *stroke* in which it is pegged out and as a consequence may not thereafter be *roqueted* (Law 22.3.1). This is a change from the 6th Edition, which allowed a *rover ball* that was *live* to be roqueted after it had hit the peg and been pegged out. If the *striker* was both incautious and unlucky and the striker's ball hit a live rover ball after the latter had bounced off the peg, the hit counted as a roquet and as a result the striker's turn ended immediately. This was felt to be unjust and out of step with other situations (e.g. the striker's ball not being able to score a peg point after making a roquet).
- C22.3.3 **EXAMPLE** B and Y are both *rover balls*. Bab, playing B, *takes croquet* from R and in the *stroke* R hits Y, which is *live*, onto the peg. Y bounces off the peg and is then hit by B. Y is pegged out and becomes *dead* as soon as it hits the peg, so the collision with B is not a roquet. Following the stroke, Y is removed from the game and B remains where it came to rest after bouncing off Y. Bab is entitled to continue the turn by playing a *continuation stroke*.

C22.4 **REMOVAL FROM COURT** It is lawful to delay removing a pegged-out ball from the court until after the *stroke* following the one in which it is pegged out, provided it is unlikely to interfere with that stroke (Law 22.4). If it does interfere with that stroke, however, or if it is not then removed from the court, the law relating to *interference* by a pegged-out ball not removed from the game (Law 31) applies. This legitimises a common practice when the *striker* is about to peg out the *striker's ball* to complete the game or to continue the turn after pegging out an opponent's ball.

SECTION B: IRREGULARITIES IN PLAY

This section contains laws that cover both *errors* in play and *interference* with play (collectively known as irregularities), including laws dealing with the interactions between errors and interferences. Laws setting out general principles applicable to errors only and those governing the specific errors that may be committed are in section C. Likewise, laws covering interferences only are in section D.

There is a distinction between *errors* and *interferences*. Errors are mistakes, by the *striker* or a player incorrectly acting as the striker, that involve playing a *stroke* in ways that are not in accordance with these laws; a fault is a specific type of error. Interferences are caused either by influences external to the striker (including the opponent and the physical environment) that affect the striker's play, or activities by any of the players of the game or by agencies unconnected with the game that disturb either the positions or courses of the balls, or the accidental involvement in play of a ball that is not part of the game.

C23 FORESTALLING PLAY

C23.1 **HOW TO FORESTALL** The definition of *forestalling* in the glossary and Law 23.1 specify the purpose for which the opponent is entitled to forestall, how to forestall and an objective test of whether or not the opponent has been successful in forestalling. There are three significant elements:

- C23.1.1 The opponent must be acting to fulfil the responsibilities assigned to the players for the conduct of the game (see Law 55), usually to inform the *striker* of an *error* or *interference* that has been committed or may be about to be committed, or to request the striker to have a *questionable stroke* watched if the striker has failed to take the initiative and call a referee.
- C23.1.2 The request may take any suitable form and need not begin with the words "Please stop play". It is more usual to begin with the *striker's* name. An argument from the striker that

the calling of his or her name is not in itself a request to cease play and could therefore be ignored, deserves to get short shrift from a referee.

- C23.1.3 The request must be made in a manner that could reasonably be expected to convey the request. This does not depend on the hearing abilities of the *striker*, but will depend on the physical circumstances. More volume will be required in a gale or under the flight-path of a low-flying jet. It may be necessary to run onto the court and stand in front of a deaf player to halt play, but the opponent would then be entitled to ask for play to be taken back to when a reasonable attempt at *forestalling* was made.

C23.2 WHEN A PLAYER MUST CEASE OR FORESTALL PLAY

- C23.2.1 Law 23.2 sets out when either player in the game is obliged to cease play or *forestall*, subject, in the case of the opponent, to the exceptions specified in Law 23.3 (see section C23.3 below) and the restrictions on timing specified in Law 23.4 (see section C23.4 below).
- C23.2.1.1 The opponent must *forestall* to get a *questionable stroke* watched if the *striker* appears to be about to play it without asking for it to be watched.
- C23.2.1.2 The opponent must *forestall* to warn the *striker* that an *interference* or non-fatal *error* (i.e. one that does not necessarily end the turn) is about to occur.
- C23.2.1.3 Either player must cease play or *forestall* when the player realises that an *error* or an *interference* has occurred (but see also paragraph C23.2.3 below).
- C23.2.1.4 The opponent must *forestall* to inform the *striker* that the *striker's* turn has not been completed, typically when the *striker* appears to be unaware that a *roquet* has been made or a *continuation stroke* remains to be played.
- C23.2.1.5 Either player must cease play or *forestall* on becoming aware that a clip is misplaced.
- C23.2.1.6 Either player must cease play or *forestall* on becoming aware that a movable *boundary marking* has become displaced.
- C23.2.2 Law 23.2.2 specifically requires the opponent to *forestall* when some non-fatal *error* or an *interference* is about to occur, even though the opponent may reasonably expect that the *striker's* turn will be about to end for some other reason. The prohibition on forestalling applies only to the fatal mistakes listed in Law 23.3.
- C23.2.3 Law 23.2.3, requiring the opponent to *forestall* when an *error* or an *interference* has already occurred, is qualified by the prohibition on forestalling set out in Law 23.3. The combined effect of these two laws is that the opponent is prohibited from forestalling when the *striker* has already committed one of the non-fatal errors covered by Laws 28.5 to 28.8 but is about to make one of the fatal mistakes listed in Law 23.3.

C23.3 WHEN OPPONENT MUST NOT FORESTALL

- C23.3.1 Law 23.3 sets out the fatal (i.e. turn-ending) mistakes that policy demands should NOT be *forested*. These are attempting to run a wrong hoop (which ends the turn and is likely to lead to the *striker* playing when not entitled, an *error* covered by Law 26), playing a *wrong ball* (Law 27) and playing a *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball* (Law 28.4). The reason for the policy is to avoid bad blood: if the opponent was under the normal duty to forestall in advance but failed to do so, the reason could be either genuine failure to notice or deliberate blindness so as not to warn the *striker* and thus gain the innings. Human nature being what it is, some *strickers* would assume the less honourable reason and relationships would be strained.
- C23.3.2 The prohibition on *forestalling* does not apply if a fatal *error* has already occurred, nor if the *striker* is about to play when not entitled to do so, e.g. after running the wrong hoop.

C23.4 DISTRACTING THE STRIKER

- C23.4.1 Law 23.4 governs the timing of a *forestalling* request by the opponent. The policy is that the opponent should intervene between *strokes*, to avoid putting the *striker* off. In

particular, there should be no profit to the opponent in forestalling half-way through a stroke for trivial reasons, such as a ball unconnected with the stroke being marginally *misplaced*. If a wrongly timed intervention materially affects the striker's play, the striker is entitled to a *replay* under Law 35.1.2 (opponent interfering with the playing of a stroke).

C23.4.2 Law 23.4 does admit of emergencies, however, such as realising that an important *limit of claims* will pass if the mallet hits the ball, or for some other urgent reason relevant to the *stroke*, including that the *striker* is about to be hit by a ball from another game. Then the opponent can bellow "X, stop!" fortissimo without reservations.

C23.4.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab accidentally *peels* R through hoop 1, but forgets to move the clip to hoop 2. Sometime later, Roy plays R and gets position to run hoop 1. As he is about to play the hoop stroke, Bab realises her mistake and hastily intervenes because Roy is about to run the wrong hoop. Although she has *forestalled* during a *stroke*, the intervention is justified. The situation can be remedied and Roy is likely to be justified under Law 32 in *replaying* at least the current turn, and possibly an earlier turn if that involved preparations to score hoop 1.

C23.5 **WHY FORESTALL** The policy reason for requiring the opponent to *forestall* even when doing so may be to the opponent's disadvantage (see Law 55.2.2), is that both players have a duty to ensure that the game is played according to the Laws. It is generally easier, and less likely to cause disputes, to sort out problems before, or as soon as possible after, they arise, rather than sometime later.

C24 MULTIPLE ERRORS AND INTERFERENCES

C24.1 This law applies to all situations where the players *discover* that more than one *error* and/or *interference* that have not already been resolved have occurred. They may have occurred in the same *stroke* or in different strokes. Situations involving only a single error are covered by Law 25, while situations involving a single interference are covered by Law 30.

C24.2 This law also covers situations where an *interference* is being remedied by taking play back to the earlier time when it first affected play and it is *discovered* that one or more *errors* had also occurred that were within their *limits of claims* at that earlier time (Law 24.4).

C24.3 To assist in applying this law, Law 24.2 brings together the definitions of when each of the *errors* (covered by Laws 26 to 29 and, for alternate stroke doubles, Law 48) and the *interferences* (covered by Laws 31 to 38) occurs.

C24.3.1 Of necessity, the *errors* covered by Laws 26 to 28 (playing when not entitled, playing a *wrong ball*, playing when a ball is *misplaced*) and Law 48.4 (playing out of sequence in alternate stroke doubles) occur when a *stroke* that breaches those laws is played.

C24.3.2 A fault under Law 29 may occur either when a *stroke* is played (e.g. failing to strike the *striker's ball* with the end-face of the mallet, damaging the court etc.) or at some later time during the stroke (e.g. allowing the *striker's ball* to retouch the mallet).

C24.3.3 *Interferences* under Law 31 (ball wrongly removed or not removed from the game) and Law 32 (playing when misled) occur when play is first affected by them, as defined in the relevant parts of those laws.

C24.3.4 *Interferences* under Law 33 (using a ball that is an *outside agency*) and Law 35 (interference with the playing of a *stroke*) occur when the first stroke affected by the interference is played.

C24.3.5 *Interferences* under Law 34 (interference with a ball) and Laws 36 to 38 (interfering with a ball between *strokes*, interference by natural forces or the environment, miscellaneous interference) occur at the point before or during a stroke when play is affected by them.

C24.4 PRECEDENCE

C24.4.1 The general principle set out in Law 24.3 for dealing with these complicated situations is that the *errors* and/or *interferences* that have been *discovered* are considered in the order in which they occurred, starting with the earliest. That general principle is subject to the

supplementary conditions specified in Laws 24.3.1 to 24.3.5, as described in paragraphs C24.4.1.1 to C24.4.1.5 below.

- C24.4.1.1 The first condition (Law 24.3.1) is that an *error* or *interference* that is past its *limit of claims* at the time of *discovery* is ignored. This is in turn subject to Law 24.4 (earlier errors discovered when an interference is being remedied), which covers circumstances in which earlier errors become relevant because the remedying of an interference takes play back to a point that is within their limits of claims (see section C24.6 below).
- C24.4.1.2 The second condition (Law 24.3.2) is that if more than one *error* or *interference* occurred when a *stroke* was played, the interferences are considered first in the order of the laws that apply (i.e. whichever of Laws 31 to 38 are relevant) followed by any errors in the order of the laws that apply, i.e. whichever of Laws 26 to 29 are relevant. (Law 48.4, as the lowest priority error, can never govern what happens in situations where multiple mistakes have occurred.)
- C24.4.1.3 The third condition (Law 24.3.3) is that if incorrect equipment materially affects the outcome of a *stroke* (an *interference* covered by Law 38.2) and a fault under Law 29 occurs later in the same stroke, the fault must be dealt with first if the players agree or a referee decides that the fault was not caused by the interference.
- C24.4.1.4 The fourth condition (Law 24.3.4) is that if play is cancelled or a *stroke* is *replayed* to remedy an *interference* or *rectify* an *error*, any remaining errors or interferences are ignored. This has the effect of terminating the sequential consideration of errors and/or interferences that the general principle specified in Law 24.3 requires.
- C24.4.1.5 The fifth and final condition (Law 24.3.5) is that if it is found that incorrect equipment has materially affected the outcome of a *stroke*, the equipment must be corrected before its incorrect setting might next affect play, regardless of whatever other action is taken to deal with the multiple mistakes.

C24.4.2 Both the general principle in Law 24.3 of considering multiple *errors* and/or *interferences* in the order in which they occurred, and the specific way Law 24.3.2 requires errors or interferences occurring simultaneously to be treated have implications when a non-fatal error (covered by Laws 28.5 to 28.8 and, in alternate stroke doubles, Law 48.4) occurs simultaneously with or is followed by a fault. Their normal application would cause the fault to be ignored. It is felt, however, that the *striker* (or side in alternate stroke doubles) should not be entitled to continue the turn after committing a fatal error just because a non-fatal error preceded it or occurs in the same *stroke*. The same principle applies if the striker (or side in alternate stroke doubles) commits one of the non-fatal errors and in the same stroke or subsequently makes a mistake that causes the turn to end (e.g. sending a ball off the court in a *croquet stroke*).

C24.4.3 It is for these reasons that when *errors* under Laws 28.5 to 28.8 and Law 48.4 are being *rectified*, those laws require a check to be made to see whether any of the turn-ending events listed in Law 7.6 has occurred. If one has, the error is rectified in accordance with the applicable law (Laws 28.5 to 28.8 or Law 48.4) but the turn then ends with the balls in those positions. See paragraphs C24.5.1 and C24.5.2 for examples. The miscellaneous error cases covered by Law 28.2.5 are different: the *stroke* is lawful once played but if any turn-ending event occurs during the stroke, the law applicable to that event will apply.

C24.4.4 Note, however, that this exception to the general application of Law 24.3 does not apply if a fault was committed during play that was affected by an *interference* and cancelled when remedying it. In that case, the fault is ignored, as it occurred during play that should not have occurred.

C24.5 EXAMPLES OF THE APPLICATION OF LAW 24.3

C24.5.1 Roy correctly took off with R from Y, which was on the *yard-line*, at the start of his turn, intending to get a rush on B, which was by a distant hoop. While placing Y back on the yard-line, he failed to notice that R hit B in the *stroke*, before stopping in a *hindered*

position near the hoop. He attempted to *roquet* B (again), but committed a fault. Two *errors* occurred simultaneously in that stroke: failing to *take croquet* from B when required to do so (Law 28.6) and the fault. Under Law 24.3.2, it is Law 28.6 that applies, since it precedes the law on faults (Law 29). R is placed anywhere in contact with B. Law 28.6.2 then requires consideration of whether an event listed in Law 7.6 has occurred. One has – the fault. The turn ends with the balls in the positions described above. Bab cannot have the balls left where they ended up, as she could have done had the stroke been only a fault.

- C24.5.1.1 In this example, if Bab notices that R *roqueted* B in the *croquet stroke*, Law 23.2.2 requires her to *forestall* Roy when he prepares to roquet B again, making it apparent he had not noticed the roquet. She would be required to forestall because an *error* under Law 28.6 (failing to take croquet when required to do so) was about to occur, even though it might be apparent that Roy was at risk of committing a fault in the *stroke* he was about to play. Should Bab not forestall in circumstances where it was evident that she was aware of the original roquet on B, she would be in breach of Law 23.2.2. A referee appealed to could consider whether and in what form the overriding Law 63.2.2 might be applied.
- C24.5.2 Bab, playing K, *roquets* R but then places K in contact with a *live* Y and plays a take-off to get a rush on R. In the *croquet stroke*, Bab fails to move or shake Y. She then realises that she should have *taken croquet* from R. She has played an unlawful croquet stroke involving a live ball (Law 28.5 applies) and simultaneously committed a fault (Law 29). Law 24.3 requires the unlawful croquet stroke *error* to be dealt with first. It is *rectified* by placing K in contact with R (Y will still be lawfully placed) and Law 28.5 would then permit Bab to resume the turn if no turn-ending event had occurred. But one has – the fault – so Bab's turn ends.
- C24.5.3 Roy, playing R, *roquets* Y but then switches to using Y as the *striker's ball*. He plays what he thinks is a *croquet stroke*, sending R as a pioneer to his next hoop. On its way to that hoop, R collides with a stationary Green. Roy's *error* is then *discovered*. Roy has played the *wrong ball* (Y instead of R – Law 27) and simultaneously played an unlawful croquet stroke involving what Roy believed was a *live ball*. (Note that because R was the striker's ball its *live / dead* status is undefined). Later in the stroke there was *interference* with a ball by an *outside agency* (Green – Law 34). Law 24.3 requires the wrong ball error to be dealt with first (it occurred before the interference by Green and Law 27 precedes Law 28). It is *rectified* by replacing the balls in a lawful position (R in contact with Y where the croquet stroke should have been played from) and the turn ends. Because play is cancelled to rectify the wrong ball error, the remaining error (unlawful croquet stroke) is ignored. The subsequent interference (R colliding with Green) is also ignored in Roy's game, though the players of the *double-banked* game need to be consulted about Green's position.
- C24.5.4 Roy, playing R rushes Y off the court, R also going off the court. Roy retrieves his Y and the K from the adjacent court. He places K on the *yard-line* and plays what he thinks is a *croquet stroke* using Y as the *striker's ball* (*wrong ball* – Law 27) and "*taking croquet*" from K (involving an *outside agency* in play – an *interference* under Law 33). At that point he *discovers* there are two black balls on the court. The wrong ball *error* and the interference of using an outside agency occurred simultaneously. Law 24.3.2 requires the interference to be dealt with first. It is remedied by cancelling the affected croquet stroke and returning the balls to the positions they lawfully occupied at that time. Y must be placed on the yard-line nearest the point where it left the court, R must be placed in contact with Y and K must be restored to its owner. Under Law 24.3.4 the wrong ball error is ignored. Roy is entitled to continue the turn. Note carefully how the application of Law 24.3 (in this case the combination of Laws 24.3.2 and 24.3.4) means that when an interference and a fatal error occur simultaneously, the fatal error is overridden by the remedying of the interference if the latter causes play to be cancelled.
- C24.5.5 In level singles Roy accidentally causes the *striker's ball* R, a *rover ball*, to hit the peg when he was trying to *roquet* Y. He fails to remove R from the court (which will cause an

interference under Law 31 when R's incorrect presence affects play). Bab plays B and roquets K but then switches balls. Playing K, she *takes croquet* from B, then uses Y and then R (so that play has certainly been affected by R's incorrect presence). Her use of R makes Roy realise that R should have been removed from the court and he *forestalls* play (within the *limit of claims* of the *wrong ball error*). Which mistake occurred first: the incorrect presence of R on the court affecting play, or Bab's playing of the wrong ball? Roy may argue that play was affected only when Bab prepared to use R, after the wrong ball error had been committed, meaning that the wrong ball error must be dealt with first. Bab's turn would end and it would be Roy's turn to play. Bab, however, may argue that the incorrect presence of R affected her turn from the beginning and therefore play should revert to the start of her turn. It is her turn to play and she may play either ball. A referee may need to adjudicate their competing claims.

C24.6 EARLIER ERRORS DISCOVERED WHEN AN INTERFERENCE IS BEING REDRESSED

C24.6.1 If a long-*limit of claims interference* is being *redressed* and as part of that process it is *discovered* that one or more *errors* had occurred before play was first affected by the interference and they were within their limits of claims when play was affected, the laws governing those errors must be applied as though the errors had been discovered at that time (Law 24.4). The effect is that the redressing of the interference takes play back to an earlier time, and the *rectification* of an error that was then within its limit of claims causes play to be taken back to a still earlier time. Applying this law can be challenging even for experienced referees, with consequences, including the positioning of balls and clips, very different from what might be expected.

C24.6.1.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab plays a break with K, but at hoop 9 she switches to playing B, which is for hoop 8. Bab takes the break to the peg using B and pegs out R, which is a *rover ball*. She makes a leave in corner II, setting a long rush for K on B towards hoop 8 and places the black clip on the peg without *discovering* that anything is amiss. Roy takes a lift with Y, shoots at B and misses. This takes the *error* of playing the *wrong ball* at hoop 9 past its *limit of claims*. Bab now discovers that the leave is set for the ball which has its clip on the peg. A referee helps the players sort out what happened. Bab cannot peg out R while playing the wrong ball (Law 27.4), so R must be returned to the game and Law 31 applied. Play reverts to the point where it was first affected by R being wrongly removed from the game. Roy may say this was when he decided to take the lift with Y. Bab might say it was even earlier, when she was doing her leave. Either way, the wrong ball error was within its limit of claims when the *interference* affected play. The error must be dealt with. It is remedied by placing all balls in the positions they lawfully occupied when Bab played the wrong ball at hoop 9 and the black clip is placed on that hoop. Bab's turn ends.

SECTION C: ERRORS IN PLAY

C25 GENERAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING ERRORS

C25.1 **DELIBERATE ERRORS** Should a player deliberately commit an *error*, a referee appealed to can impose whatever penalty the referee considers appropriate under the overriding law, provided the referee is satisfied that the player deliberately committed the error. It is Law 63.2.1 (a deliberate breach of the law) that applies.

C25.2 RECTIFICATION

C25.2.1 If an *error* is *discovered* within its *limit of claims*, it is *rectified* (Law 25.3, but note that rectification is optional when the error is a fault – see paragraph C25.2.3 below). Rectification involves placing the balls in positions they could lawfully have occupied at the start of the first *stroke in error*, and cancelling any points scored for any ball during any stroke in error. If there was more than one lawful position for a ball, the player who committed the error chooses in which of those positions the ball should be placed. (Again,

note the special conditions applying when a fault was committed – see paragraph C25.2.3 below).

C25.2.2 Whether the *striker* remains in play following an *error* or the turn ends depends on the nature of the error and is specified in each of the applicable laws. If the turn ends, the clips must then be placed appropriately.

C25.2.3 The opponent is entitled to choose whether or not a fault should be *rectified*. Rectification, if the opponent chooses it, occurs as described in paragraph C25.2.1 above, except that the balls must be placed where they were at the start of the *stroke* in which the fault was committed – if there is more than one lawful position for a ball, the player who committed the fault has no choice. If the opponent chooses not to rectify a fault, the balls remain, or are placed, in the positions they lawfully occupied at the end of the stroke in which the fault was committed. Whether or not rectification is chosen, no points scored during any *stroke in error* count and the turn ends. See paragraph C29.21.2 below for further considerations applying to the opponent's choice of whether or not to rectify a fault.

C25.2.4 When balls are placed to *rectify* an *error*, the lawful position of a ball may be some distance from where it was located when the first *stroke in error* was played.

C25.2.4.1 **EXAMPLE** The *striker* sends the croqueted ball off the court in a *cannon*, but does not notice until after *taking croquet* from the ball *roqueted* in the cannon, which the mistake meant the striker was not entitled to do. *Rectification* of the *error* (playing when not entitled, Law 26) requires the *striker's ball* to be placed where it came to rest after the cannon, rather than in contact with the ball it roqueted, because under Law 17.3.4 the striker's ball does not become a *ball in hand* to be repositioned.

C25.2.5 The fact that a player who commits an *error* is entitled, when *rectifying* the error, to choose any position for a ball that it could lawfully have occupied at the start of the first *stroke in error* can have unexpected consequences.

C25.2.5.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy is entitled to an advanced play lift, but he lifts B and plays it from baulk. The *error* is claimed. B is restored to its lawful position on the court and Roy is then entitled, should he so choose, to move either R or Y from where it lies to any point on either *baulk-line*. The turn then ends. Under Law 16.2.2.1 Roy is responsible for the positions of B, R and Y by virtue of having lifted and played the *wrong ball*.

C25.3 **LIMIT OF CLAIMS** The *limit of claims* for an *error* is specified in its own paragraph under each of the relevant laws. Limits of claims are always either when a specific *stroke* is played (a definite instant in time) or the end of the game. A summary of the various limits is in Table 2 in the Laws. In general, the greater the disruption to the normal course of the game caused by making an error, the longer the limit of claims and the greater the penalty if the error is *discovered* in time. For minor *misplacements* of a ball caused by factors outside the *striker's* control (Law 28.3) and the miscellaneous cases of playing with a ball *misplaced* (Law 28.2.5), the applicable laws do not specify a limit of claims. Those errors cannot be *rectified* once the stroke has been played, defining an implicit limit of claims.

C25.3.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy plays R and *roquets* K, but places R in contact with B and plays a *croquet stroke*, in reality unlawful. If B is *dead*, Law 28.4 governs what happens and the *limit of claims* is when Bab plays the first *stroke* of her next turn (Law 28.4.2). On the other hand, if B is *live*, the *error* is dealt with under Law 28.5 and the limit of claims is when the third *stroke in error* is played (Law 28.5.3). In that situation, if R goes on to roquet Y (the second stroke in error) and the error is then *discovered*, it is *rectified*. Once R takes croquet from Y (the third stroke in error), however, the error goes past its limit of claims and it is not then rectified. If B went off when Roy played the unlawful croquet stroke involving the live B, Roy's turn would end before the limit of claims was reached. Under Law 25.4 the limit of claims would then be when Bab played the first stroke of her next turn (or, if Roy took a *bisque*, when he played the first stroke of the bisque turn).

C25.4 DISCOVERY AFTER LIMIT OF CLAIMS Law 25.5.1 lays down the principle that if an *error* is not *discovered* until after its *limit of claims*, it is ignored and so the balls and clips remain where they are. There are three important exceptions.

- C25.4.1 Only hoops run in order count. Hoops run out of order are not scored, and if a clip has been wrongly advanced it must be corrected at any time before the end of the game. See paragraphs C26.6.2 and C26.6.3 below for examples. A wrongly advanced clip creates a risk of further points being scored out of order subsequently, compounding the problem.
- C25.4.2 The reference to Law 45.4 in Law 25.5.2 expresses a fundamental principle of ordinary doubles play that each player should play only one ball. A strong player should not be able to mask the *partner's* weaknesses by scoring points directly for the partner's ball. (In handicap doubles play, the same principle operates to limit the number of *peels* on the partner's ball to four.) Accordingly, if the *striker* should play the partner's ball in error and thereby appear to score a point in order for that ball (or to score a fifth peel in handicap doubles play), these apparent points are ignored if the *error* is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game. These are further instances of a wrongly advanced clip creating risks of points being scored out of order subsequently.
- C25.4.3 Law 27.4, referenced in Law 25.5.2, states that a peg point may not be scored for any ball when striking an enemy ball. This prevents Bab, should she play R, a *rover ball*, from pegging it out by hitting it onto the peg or from pegging out B, also a rover ball, in a *wrong ball croquet stroke*. If this form of wrong ball *error* is committed and is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game, Law 31 applies and the game is restored to its position when the unlawful peg-out first affected play. This will also allow *rectification* of the wrong ball error that led to the peg-out. See also the example at paragraph C24.6.1.1 above.

C26 PLAYING WHEN NOT ENTITLED

C26.1 APPLICABILITY This law combines two different laws from the 6th Edition: playing when not entitled and playing when *forestalled*, on the basis that the latter is just an instance of the former. The law avoids the use of the terms "*striker*" and "opponent", as these can be very confusing when someone is playing when not entitled, which means playing when it is the other side's turn to play or playing when no-one should be playing at all. The following situations are covered by this law.

- C26.1.1 A player ends a turn having been the *striker*, and is therefore no longer the striker, but continues to play in the misapprehension that further *strokes* are permitted in that turn (Law 26.1.1).
- C26.1.2 A player starts a turn when the other player's turn is still lawfully in progress, as a result of either a misapprehension or impatience (Law 26.1.2). In extreme circumstances, both players may be playing simultaneously. *Strokes* that they play may or may not interfere with each other (usually they will not, as otherwise someone would notice the odd situation).
- C26.1.3 The *striker* continues to play one or more *strokes* after the opponent has *forestalled* play in accordance with Law 23 and play is therefore temporarily suspended. This applies regardless of whether the striker fails to hear the opponent, or does hear the opponent but chooses to ignore the request to cease play. It may be that once the matter the opponent wishes to raise has been settled, the striker will be entitled to resume the turn and repeat the stroke or strokes unlawfully played after being forestalled.
- C26.1.4 The *striker* plays a *stroke* before the preceding one has ended and one stroke affects the other, either because balls affected by the two strokes collide or because the first stroke causes the turn to end, meaning the striker was not entitled to play the second stroke. See the description at paragraph C8.2.2 above (Law 26.1.4).

C26.2 PLAYER CONTINUING AFTER TURN ENDS

- C26.2.1 A player might play more *strokes* than are permitted in a turn for various reasons, for example by carrying on after running a hoop out of order, or by "roqueting" and "taking

croquet" from the *partner ball* for a second time without having scored a *hoop point* in between, or possibly by failing to notice that a ball went off the court in a *croquet stroke*. Providing the *error* is noticed before its *limit of claims* (when the first stroke is played in the other side's next turn) any points scored in the excess strokes are cancelled and the balls are replaced in their lawful positions at the end of the last valid stroke. The opponent then starts the next turn (unless the offender takes a *bisque*).

C26.2.1.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy plays R and *roquets* Y. He *takes croquet* from Y, then successively roquets and takes croquet from B and then K without getting in position to score a *hoop point*. When R returns to Y on the *croquet stroke* from K, Roy finds that R appears to have a useful rush on Y. He therefore plays the "rush" and then takes croquet from Y, at which point Bab belatedly realises something is wrong and intervenes to point out that Roy had already used Y. Roy is playing when not entitled and the balls must be replaced in their lawful positions before the first *stroke* he was not entitled to play: the second croquet stroke involving Y. Y is replaced where it came to rest after being hit by R for the second time (a lawful stroke but not a roquet), while R is replaced where it came to rest after bouncing off Y. These positions are likely to be very different from what Roy had in mind, and not at all to his advantage.

C26.2.2 Running a hoop out of order is not itself an *error*. The *stroke* stands, but does not score a point or (unless it was a *croquet stroke*) earn a *continuation stroke* and the player's turn ends. Continuing to play after that, however, is playing when not entitled.

C26.3 **PLAYER PLAYS BEFORE PREVIOUS TURN COMPLETED** A second case of playing when not entitled, covered by Law 26.1.2, is where Roy starts playing before Bab has finished tidying up the balls and clips at the end of a turn (and no permission has been granted under Law 7.5.2.2). In this case, if Bab objects, the balls are replaced and points cancelled, but it will be Roy, the offender, who plays once Bab, the non-offender, has tidied up (unless Bab takes a *bisque*), and the *limit of claims* is the start of Bab's next turn.

C26.4 **PLAYERS PLAY AT SAME TIME** Things get more complex in the rarer cases where both players are playing *strokes* at the same time (also covered by Law 26.1.2). This can occur, for example, if a player fails to notice that the other player, as the *striker*, has made a *roquet* and is therefore entitled to continue the turn. The player who began to play prematurely is playing when not entitled and when it is realised what is occurring, the stroke(s) played by that player are cancelled and balls moved in those stroke(s) are replaced. By contrast, strokes played by the player who was legitimately in play are valid. It is to cover such situations that Law 26.2.2 specifies that only some balls should be replaced. The *limit of claims* is when the first stroke is played in the non-offender's next turn, though the nature of the *error* means it is likely to be *discovered* sooner than that.

C26.5 **PLAYER CONTINUES PLAYING AFTER BEING FORESTALLED** Play is suspended once the opponent *forestalls* (Law 26.1.3), and if the *striker* continues playing thereafter any *strokes* played are cancelled once play is stopped. Once the issue the opponent wishes to raise has been settled, the player who is entitled to play then plays. The *limit of claims* is when the first stroke of the opponent's next turn is played, but this is unlikely to be relevant as the opponent can be expected to insist that the striker stop play. It may be relevant, however, in situations such as when the opponent is distracted or the striker has not offered the opponent the option of having the balls replaced after a fault and quickly taken a *bisque*. The opponent's right to suspend play will prevail.

C26.6 **DISCOVERY AFTER LIMIT OF CLAIMS**

C26.6.1 If the *error* of playing when not entitled is *discovered* only after its *limit of claims*, it is ignored and points scored in order for any ball during the *strokes in error* are counted (as specified in Law 25.5.1). The reason for this is to avoid serious disruption to the game if the error comes to light (possibly because of an unguarded comment by a spectator) many turns later.

C26.6.2 This does not extend to points claimed out of order, which are cancelled if the *error* is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game.

C26.6.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy made a break with R, apparently from hoop 7 (1-back) to the peg, and also made a straight *peel* of Y through hoop 11 (penultimate). During some later turn (i.e. after the *limit of claims*) it was realised that Roy had missed out hoop 9 (3-back) in the break. The peel on Y stands (a point scored in order), but the red clip goes back to hoop 9. Bab may be entitled to a *replay* under Law 32.1.3 if she was misled by the red clip being on the peg rather than hoop 9.

C26.6.3 If the *striker* re-runs a hoop that the *striker's ball* has already scored and the *error* of continuing to play afterwards is not noticed until after its *limit of claims* (when the opponent plays the first *stroke* of the next turn), any such re-run hoops are ignored, and all hoops scored that are in sequence under Law 2.4 are validly run.

C26.6.3.1 **EXAMPLE** In a 22-point game starting at hoop 3, Bab played a break in which B ran hoops 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Bab then realised the *error* when Roy, playing R went around in the correct order. The blue clip remains on hoop 7 (1-back), as 5 was in order after she first ran 4. The positions of the balls are not altered.

C27 PLAYING A WRONG BALL

C27.1 APPLICABILITY

C27.1.1 Law 27 covers situations where the *striker*:

C27.1.1.1 has validly chosen the *striker's ball* for the turn by playing it or by lifting it under Laws 16 (wiring lift) or 39 (advanced play) or 40 (super-advanced play) but then plays the *partner ball* (Law 27.1.1.1); or

C27.1.1.2 plays a ball that belongs to the opponent (Law 27.1.1.2); or

C27.1.1.3 plays the *partner's ball* in ordinary doubles (Law 27.1.1.3); or

C27.1.1.4 in the third or fourth turn of the game plays a ball of the side that is already in play when required to play the other ball of the side into the game (Law 27.1.1.4); or

C27.1.1.5 takes a *half-bisque* or *bisque* in handicap play, but then plays a ball that was not the *striker's ball* of the preceding turn (Law 27.1.1.5).

C27.1.2 Law 27 does not cover situations where the *striker* plays any ball that is not a *ball in play* but rather an *outside agency*. That may be either a ball from another game, or a ball that has not yet been brought into the game, or a ball that has been a ball in play but has been pegged out and removed from the game. Those are treated under the *interference* of using a ball that is an outside agency, covered by Law 33.

C27.1.3 Law 27 also does not cover the case of the wrong player of the side playing a *stroke* with a ball the side was entitled to play in alternate stroke doubles. This is the *error* of playing out of sequence covered by Law 48.4.

C27.2 **REMEDY** The *errors* described in paragraphs C27.1.1.1 to C27.1.1.5 above cause the *striker's* turn to end and the error to be *rectified* if *discovered* before the *limit of claims*, which is the earliest occasion on which either side plays the first *stroke* of a subsequent turn with a correct ball. This formulation of the limit of claims is designed to cover cases when both players get confused and play an enemy ball for a number of turns. Then, discovery of such a sequence within the limit of claims of the last such error results in the game being taken back to its last lawful position. See section C42.4.5 below for how the limit of claims for a *wrong ball* error is modified in handicap play.

C27.3 WRONG BALL PLAYED IN ONE OF THE FIRST FOUR TURNS

C27.3.1 If a *wrong ball* is played in one of the first four turns of the game and the *error* is *discovered* within its *limit of claims*, the error is *rectified* if a ball already in play was played, while if a wrong ball was played into the game it is removed from the court. In either case, a correct ball must be brought into the game, and become a *ball in play*, by being placed anywhere on either *baulk-line*, at the choice of the player who committed the error (Law 27.2.2).

C27.3.2 A ball wrongly played into the game at the start of one of the first four turns becomes a *ball in play* and remains so if the *error* is not *discovered* within its *limit of claims* (Law 27.2.3). It ceases to be a ball in play, however, if the error is discovered within the limit of claims and the error is treated as described in paragraph C27.3.1 above.

C27.4 **PLAYER OF FOURTH TURN UNABLE TO PLAY CORRECT BALL** A *wrong ball* played in the first turn of the game and not *discovered* within its *limit of claims* can lead to a sequence of play (first turn – wrong ball; second turn – correct ball, taking the wrong ball *error* past its limit of claims; third turn – correct ball) to which Law 27.2.1 does not apply yet leaves the player of the fourth turn unable to play a lawful *stroke* because both balls of the side have been played into the game and have become *balls in play*. This situation is covered by Law 27.5: the only remedy is to restart the game and, in handicap play, restore any *bisques* that may have been played (see Law 44.1.2).

C27.5 **MULTIPLE WRONG BALL ERRORS AT THE START OF A GAME** The same difficulty does not arise if a sequence of *wrong ball errors* occurs at the start of a game, because a wrong ball error does not go past its *limit of claims* until a turn is next started by a correct ball being played (Law 27.3).

C27.5.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab plays the first turn of a game, Roy the second. Balls are played into the game in the order R (wrong), B (wrong), Y (wrong). K is the only ball left for Roy to play into the game in the fourth turn and the sequence of *errors* is *discovered*. The *limit of claims* for Bab's error in the first turn has not been reached and that error must be *rectified*. All balls are removed from the game, Bab must place a correct ball (either B or K) on any point on either *baulk-line* and the first turn ends. The same remedy applies if Roy incorrectly plays K at the start of the fourth turn but the sequence of errors is then discovered during that turn.

C27.6 **REVERSAL OF INITIAL CHOICE OF BALLS** Law 27.6 provides a pragmatic solution when the players accidentally exchange colours from the start of the game and do not realise their error until after the first *stroke* of the fifth turn – perhaps not until one is about to win. It makes more sense to endorse the swap and let the players carry on.

C28 PLAYING WHEN A BALL IS MISPLACED

C28.1 APPLICABILITY

C28.1.1 An *error* is committed under Law 28 if the *striker* plays a *stroke* when one or more balls are materially *misplaced* from their lawful positions due to the actions of either player, someone who is not part of the game (double bankers, referee etc.), or natural forces (wind, gravity etc.).

C28.1.2 Unlike *errors* under the previous law, playing a *wrong ball*, or the faults in the next law, the errors covered by this law are not in themselves fatal, with the exception of those covered by Law 28.4, playing an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball*.

C28.2 GENERAL

C28.2.1 Once a ball is found to be in a *misplaced* position it must be correctly placed. If there is more than one lawful position, the player who should have placed the ball correctly has the choice of where it is placed (Law 28.2.1).

C28.2.2 Note that Law 28.2.1 says nothing about moving any other ball when a *misplaced ball* is returned to its correct position.

C28.2.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy, playing R, attempts to get a rush on B in a particular direction but before he plays the rush, he sees a marker a yard or so to one side of B and *discovers* that the marker indicates the correct position of B. B must be correctly placed but R is not moved. If it was the opponent or a player from another game who had moved B, Roy may be able to sustain a claim under Law 32 of playing when misled by the *misplacement* of B. If Roy himself had earlier moved B and had forgotten to replace it, however, then he must play as the balls now correctly lie.

- C28.2.3 Law 28.2.1 requires the opponent to *forestall* upon observing that the *striker* is about to play while a ball is *misplaced*, unless the striker is about to commit one of the fatal mistakes listed in Law 23.3 – run a wrong hoop, play a *wrong ball* or play an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball*. The rationale for the obligation to forestall is that it is easier to sort things out beforehand rather than afterwards.
- C28.2.4 Despite the general obligation on the players to correct the position of a *misplaced ball*, Law 28.2.2 permits the *striker* to play, knowing that a ball has been moved to get it out of the way of a *double-banked game*, provided the striker reasonably believes that the *stroke* about to be played will not affect that ball in its lawful position, nor in the position to which it has been temporarily moved. A ball moved for this reason is ignored when applying Laws 28.3 to 28.8. This is a new law in the 7th Edition, replacing an official ruling that had the same effect.
- C28.2.5 If the *striker* plays a *stroke* when one or more balls became *misplaced* by natural forces just before the stroke was played, Law 28.3 must be applied before applying the remainder of Law 28 (see Law 28.2.3 and section C28.3 below).
- C28.2.5.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab is about to play a mini-*cannon*, playing K, with R as the croqueted ball and Y as the third ball. As she is swinging her mallet to play the *stroke*, the wind causes Y to move so that K is in contact with both R and Y when the stroke is played. Law 28.3.2 means that K is deemed to have been not in contact with Y when the stroke was played. Consequently, Law 28.5 (unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *live ball*) is not applicable and the cannon was valid. In particular, K is considered to have *roqueted* Y even though K and Y were in contact when the stroke was played.
- C28.2.6 If the *striker* plays a *stroke* when a ball is *misplaced* and the *error* is subsequently *discovered*, an error is committed under only the first of the relevant laws in the list of Laws 28.4 to 28.8.
- C28.2.7 Law 28.2.5 specifies that in all instances of playing when a ball is *misplaced* other than those covered by Laws 28.3 to 28.8, the *stroke* is lawful (subject to any other *errors* or *interferences* that might occur during the stroke). The game continues as if the misplaced ball lawfully occupied the position it was in.
- C28.2.7.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy *roquets* B with R but is then told by the double-bankers that B had not been replaced after being moved to make way for their game. Roy's roquet is valid and he has no redress unless he can claim to have been misled by the *misplacement* of B into adopting a *line of play* he would not otherwise have taken.
- C28.2.8 When a ball is *misplaced*, it remains misplaced until either the misplacement is *discovered* and it is lawfully placed or it is moved by a *stroke* (Law 28.2.6).
- C28.2.9 Law 28 (apart from Law 28.3) applies only to *misplacement* that occurred before the start of a *stroke*. Except in the circumstances covered by Law 28.3, if *interference* occurs during a stroke, causing a ball to become misplaced, Law 34 applies to that stroke, but Law 28 will apply to subsequent strokes if the interference is not noticed and the affected balls have not been moved in the course of play.
- C28.2.10 A difficulty arises if the incoming *striker* finds two, typically *yard-line*, balls in close proximity (touching or just apart) but their relative positions are different from where the opponent believed they had been left. This can lead to the incoming striker playing a rush or *taking croquet* when the opponent was expecting the opposite.
- C28.2.10.1 The 7th Edition deals with this problem by adding a recommendation in Law 15.8 that the *striker* should advise the opponent of the relationship between two balls that the striker has just placed either close together or in contact (see also paragraph C15.4.2 above).
- C28.2.10.2 This should avoid the difficulty in most situations, but if not, the interaction between Laws 28 and 32 may still give rise to uncertainty. It might be impossible to tell

whether the opponent *misplaced* one or more balls, interfered with the balls after placing them correctly, or they subsequently moved relative to each other. If the players hold different opinions on the placement of the balls, the overriding law (Law 63) may need to be invoked to ensure that neither player is seriously disadvantaged.

C28.3 MISPLACEMENT BY NATURAL FORCES

- C28.3.1 Law 28.3 tackles situations where balls accidentally fall into contact or fall apart after the *striker* has finished adjusting or placing them and before the *stroke* is played. The *striker's* intent is then taken into account to determine the appropriate treatment of the stroke. If the *striker's ball* and the ball from which croquet is being taken move apart as a *croquet stroke* is being played, the nature of the stroke does not change. The laws applicable to croquet strokes still apply, including the requirement that the *striker* must move or shake the croqueted ball. This may seem harsh if the failure to shake was genuinely the result of the balls falling apart, but if it were not a fault then a *striker* who committed it could always claim that the balls had fallen apart, and a referee would have no way of knowing.
- C28.3.2 The balls are most unlikely to part sufficiently in a *croquet stroke* to put the *striker* at risk of having the mallet contact the *striker's ball* more than once in a manner that constitutes a fault (see Laws 29.1.6.1 and 29.2.5 and paragraph C29.11.2 below). If they part in the direction of the stroke, it is likely to be by a few millimetres at most, potentially making the croquet stroke noisy but not meeting the standard required for a multiple contact fault. The *striker* is equally unlikely to commit the fault of allowing the mallet to remain in contact with the *striker's* ball for an observable period, since the balls parting by a small amount should not cause the contact between mallet and ball to be observably prolonged beyond what would occur in a normal croquet stroke.
- C28.3.3 Law 28.3 also covers situations where the *striker* prepares to play a *stroke* when there is a very small gap between the *striker's ball* and another ball (usually but not necessarily in a *cannon*) and when the stroke is played the balls have moved into contact. Again, the nature of the stroke does not change: if the *striker* plays to *roquet* the other ball, the stroke is still a roquet even if the balls are in contact when it is played (see also the example in paragraph C28.2.5.1 above). If it was a *continuation stroke* with the balls very close together but not touching, the relevant fault laws still apply even if the balls have moved into contact when the stroke is played.

C28.4 UNLAWFUL CROQUET STROKES

- C28.4.1 The 7th Edition adopts a general definition of the term *croquet stroke*, making any *stroke* played when the *striker's ball* is in contact with another ball a croquet stroke, except when the *striker's* ball is in a lawful position in contact with a *dead ball* and the *striker* is required to play a *continuation stroke*.
- C28.4.2 With this definition, a *stroke* is a lawful *croquet stroke* if played when:
- C28.4.2.1 the *striker's ball* is in contact with the ball it *roqueted* in the preceding *stroke*; or
 - C28.4.2.2 the *striker's ball* is lawfully in contact with a *live ball* as described in Law 18.1.2 (during a turn) or Law 18.1.3 (at the start of a turn).
- C28.4.3 Otherwise, the *croquet stroke* is unlawful (in the sense that the *striker's ball* is not in a lawful position). There are two ways in which this can occur:
- C28.4.3.1 the *striker* is required to *take croquet* under Law 18.1 but not from the ball that the *striker's ball* has been placed in contact with; and
 - C28.4.3.2 the *striker* is not entitled to take croquet from any ball, because none of the requirements for taking croquet under Law 18.1 has been met.
- C28.4.4 A *stroke* played when the *striker's ball* is in a lawful position in contact with a *dead ball* following a *croquet stroke* is treated as a *continuation stroke*, not a croquet stroke.

C28.4.5 The effect of this general definition of the *croquet stroke* is that all situations dealt with as 'purporting to take croquet' in the 6th Edition are treated under the 7th Edition as unlawful croquet strokes. The change of terminology acknowledges the difficulty many had in understanding the meaning of 'purporting to take croquet'. An unlawful croquet stroke may involve either a *dead ball* or a *live ball* and the Laws treat these differently.

C28.4.6 **EXAMPLES**

C28.4.6.1 Roy, playing R, *roquets* B but places R in contact with a *live* K and plays a *stroke*. This is an unlawful *croquet stroke* as described in paragraph C28.4.3.1 above involving a *live ball*.

C28.4.6.2 At the start of Bab's turn B is in contact with R, with Y nearby. Bab picks up B but then, after looking around, places B in contact with Y and plays a *stroke*. This is also an unlawful *croquet stroke* as described in paragraph C28.4.3.1 above involving a *live ball*.

C28.4.6.3 During Roy's break with R as the *striker's ball*, R comes to rest following a *croquet stroke* near a *live* B without having *roqueted* it. Roy surveys the scene and then picks up R, places it in contact with B and plays a *stroke*. This is an unlawful croquet stroke as described in paragraph C28.4.3.2 above involving a *live ball*.

C28.4.6.4 Bab *takes croquet* with K from B and the balls come to rest in contact. Without moving K, Bab plays a further *stroke*. This is a *continuation stroke* as described in paragraph C28.4.4 above, not a *croquet stroke*, because K was in a lawful position in contact with the *dead* B when the stroke was played.

C28.4.6.5 Bab *takes croquet* with K from B, attempting an Irish peel, and the balls come to rest in contact with B in the centre of the hoop and K close to one wire. Bab moves K to a more central position and plays a *stroke* sending both balls through the hoop. This is an unlawful *croquet stroke* as described in paragraph C28.4.3.2 involving a *dead ball*.

C28.4.7 Situations where the *striker* involves an *outside agency* in the game, including where the *striker* mistakenly places the *striker's ball* in contact with an outside agency and plays a *stroke* are treated under Law 33 (using a ball that is an outside agency). Such a stroke is not treated as an unlawful *croquet stroke* under Law 28.

C28.5 **UNLAWFUL CROQUET STROKE INVOLVING A DEAD BALL**

C28.5.1 Law 28.4 covers the fatal *error* of playing an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball*, the first of three mutually exclusive errors relating to croquet strokes (the others are playing an unlawful croquet stroke involving a *live ball*, Law 28.5, and failing to *take croquet* when required to do so, Law 28.6). If the error is *discovered* within its *limit of claims*, the error is *rectified* and the turn ends.

C28.5.2 The *striker* could gain a significant advantage by *taking croquet* twice from the same ball between hoops, such as being able to rescue a much delayed peeling break. What is worse, the *error* may not be noticed until after the normal *third-stroke-in-error limit of claims*. Justice can be done only if the limit of claims is extended to when the opponent plays the first *stroke* of the opponent's next turn. The error must then be made fatal, as otherwise an unscrupulous *striker* would be tempted to 'remember' such an error many strokes ago when confronted with the imminent demise of a break.

C28.5.3 When the *striker* has attempted a *peel* only for the croqueted ball to come to rest in the hoop with the *striker's ball* in contact with it in a position from which running the hoop would be difficult, the *striker* could gain a significant advantage by moving the *striker's ball* around the *dead ball* to a more convenient place before playing the *continuation stroke*. Doing so is treated as another instance of playing an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball*. Even though the *striker* was probably under a misapprehension that moving the *striker's ball* is permitted, the *error* still needs to be made fatal, with the longer *limit of claims*.

- C28.5.4 A less likely situation that is treated as playing an unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *dead ball* is when the placement of a dead ball on the *yard-line* following the preceding *stroke* has brought that ball lawfully into contact with the *striker's ball* but the *striker* then moves the *striker's ball* to a different position in contact with the dead ball before playing the stroke.
- C28.5.5 Since the *error* is committed only if the *stroke* is played with the balls *misplaced*, the *striker* can recover after incorrectly moving the *striker's ball* in preparation for a *continuation stroke* when it is in contact with a *dead ball* and then realising that that is not permitted. The *striker* should notify the opponent of the problem, replace the *striker's ball* where it was in relation to the dead ball following the previous stroke and get the opponent's agreement that the replacement is satisfactory.

C28.6 UNLAWFUL CROQUET STROKE INVOLVING A LIVE BALL

C28.6.1 Law 28.5 covers three different situations:

- C28.6.1.1 *taking croquet* from the wrong *live ball* (see paragraph C28.4.6.1 above for an example); and
- C28.6.1.2 *taking croquet* from a *live ball* when the *striker* is not entitled to take croquet at all (see paragraph C28.4.6.3 above for an example); and
- C28.6.1.3 playing a *croquet stroke* in which the *striker's ball* is lawfully in contact with a *live ball* and also in contact with a second live ball.

It is limited to *live ball* situations. If the *striker's ball* is in contact with a *dead ball* as well as a live ball, Law 28.4 applies. Law 26 applies if the *striker* is not entitled to play a *stroke* at all.

C28.6.2 If the *error* is *discovered* before the *limit of claims*, it is *rectified*. The *stroke or strokes in error* must then be analysed to see whether a turn-ending event, as listed in Law 7.6 occurred. For this purpose, the unlawful *croquet stroke* must be treated as a normal croquet stroke in which the *live ball* was the croqueted ball (so, for example, if a ball went off the court in circumstances covered by Law 18.7, the turn ends). If any turn-ending event did occur, the *striker's* turn ends with the balls left where they were placed to rectify the error and the clips must be lawfully placed. Otherwise, the *striker* is entitled to resume the turn.

C28.6.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy plays R and *roquets* B, B stopping near K, which is *live*. Roy places R in contact with K instead of B and plays a *stroke* (unlawful *croquet stroke* involving a *live ball* – first *stroke in error*). R stops near B and Roy, thoroughly confused, then plays B and roquets R (second stroke in error for the unlawful croquet stroke). The *wrong ball error* is claimed and the players and a referee reconstruct what happened. The earliest error, the unlawful croquet stroke involving K, must be dealt with first (Law 24.3) and is *rectified*, so K is replaced in its lawful position, B is placed where it came to rest after being roqueted by R and R is placed in contact with B. Because of the subsequent wrong ball error, the turn ends. Roy is not shielded from the wrong ball error by having previously committed the non-fatal unlawful croquet stroke error.

C28.6.3 The admittedly very rare situation in which the *striker* deliberately plays a *croquet stroke* with the *striker's ball* lawfully in contact with one *live ball* and unlawfully in contact with a second live ball, as described in paragraph C28.6.1.3 above, has unexpected consequences, being likely to result in the *striker's* turn ending.

C28.6.3.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy creates a *cannon* playing R by *roqueting* B off the court so that when it is placed on the *yard-line* B is in contact with K, which is *live*. Roy arranges and plays the cannon with R deliberately placed in contact with both B and K. None of the balls leaves the court in that *stroke*. Roy picks up R, places it in contact with K and is preparing to *take croquet* when Bab *forestalls* play and queries the stroke Roy has just played. This is the situation described in paragraph C28.6.1.3 above: Roy has played a *croquet stroke* with the *striker's ball* in contact with a second live ball. All three balls

are replaced where they were when B was placed on the yard-line in contact with K. The analysis of the *stroke in error* must assume that Roy took croquet from both of the live balls. Since none of the balls went off the court, the turn does not end for that reason and no other turn-ending event occurred. Roy resumes the turn by playing a cannon correctly, taking croquet from B and with K as the third ball.

C28.6.3.2 Note that if Bab had not intervened, Roy would have been required to continue the turn by playing a *continuation stroke* from wherever R came to rest. Had Roy continued the turn, as he was evidently intending to do, by placing R in contact with K and playing a *croquet stroke*, he would have played an unlawful croquet stroke involving a *dead ball*, Law 28.4 would apply and his turn would end. In this most unusual situation, Bab should not have intervened – Law 23.3.3 (*striker* about to play a croquet stroke involving a dead ball) specifies that she must not do so, notwithstanding that Roy had already made a non-fatal *error*.

C28.6.4 Usually, the *error* covered by Law 28.5 is noticed immediately or not at all. If the error is one in which the *striker roquets a live ball* but then *takes croquet* from a different live ball, and the error is noticed only after its *limit of claims*, however, it is necessary to consider how liveness and deadness have been affected. The play is treated as valid, meaning that a lawful *croquet stroke* was played even though the croqueted ball had not been *roqueted*. The definitions of *live and dead balls* in the Laws glossary mean that the ball involved in the now-legitimised croquet stroke becomes dead, while the ball actually roqueted remains live and can be roqueted again before the next *hoop point* is scored for the *striker's ball*.

C28.6.4.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab plays B, *roquets* K, but then places B in contact with Y (*live*) and plays an unlawful *croquet stroke* (first *stroke in error*). In the following *stroke*, under the misapprehension that she roqueted R in that first error stroke, Bab places B in contact with R (*live*) and plays a second unlawful croquet stroke (second *stroke in error*). At this point Bab's *errors* are *discovered*.

C28.6.4.2 Law 28.5 must be applied to the first *error*. It is *rectified* and the subsequent play analysed to see whether a turn-ending event occurred. For this purpose, the first *croquet stroke* involving Y is treated as a lawful croquet stroke (Law 28.5.2), entitling Bab to play a *continuation stroke*. The second croquet stroke, involving R, is treated as a lawful croquet stroke as though she had *roqueted* R in the first stroke (Law 28.5.2 again). Nothing fatal has happened to end the turn, so Bab may resume by *taking croquet* from K once the first error has been rectified and all balls are lawfully placed.

C28.7 FAILING TO TAKE CROQUET WHEN REQUIRED TO DO SO

C28.7.1 Law 28.6 deals with the case when the *striker* makes a *roquet* but does not appreciate (or forgets) that the next *stroke* must be a *croquet stroke* and instead attempts something else (making another roquet, running a hoop). If the *error* is *discovered* before the third *stroke in error* it must be *rectified*. The strokes in error must then be analysed to see whether a turn-ending event has occurred. The situation is treated as though the striker never made the preceding roquet but was nevertheless entitled to play a further stroke, which is treated, of necessity, as a *single-ball stroke*. In particular, the turn ends if the striker failed to make a roquet or score a *hoop point* in that stroke (Law 7.6.1) but does not end (under Law 7.6.2) if a ball is sent off the court. The turn also ends if any of the other events listed in Law 7.6 occurred in any stroke in error. If no turn-ending event occurred, the striker is entitled to resume the turn by *taking croquet* from the ball roqueted.

C28.7.2 If the *error* is *discovered* after its *limit of claims*, play continues as though the *striker* had never made the *roquet* but had remained entitled to play. In particular, the ball hit does not have its position adjusted, nor does it become *dead*.

C28.8 FAILING TO PLAY A BALL FROM BAULK and LIFTING A BALL WHEN NOT ENTITLED TO DO SO

- C28.8.1 Laws 28.7 and 28.8 cover two related forms of playing with a ball *misplaced*, namely failing to play a lifted ball from a *baulk-line* and taking a lift when not entitled to one. The opponent must react before the third *stroke in error*, as for the other non-fatal *errors* covered by Laws 28.5 and 28.6. The same principles about end of turn also apply. Note that 'materially' in Law 28.7.1 prevents (unverifiable) claims from the opponent after a successful lift shot, or from the *striker* after an unsuccessful one, that the lift shot must be *replayed* because it was taken from a position 1 cm off the baulk-line.
- C28.8.2 If the *striker* is entitled to restart the turn under Law 28.7 after taking a lift from the wrong place, the striker must still play the ball lifted (it has been validly chosen as the *striker's ball*), but it may be played from any point on either *baulk-line* as the striker chooses.
- C28.8.3 If the *striker* is entitled to restart the turn under Law 28.8 after taking a lift when not entitled to one, the *striker's ball* for the turn has not been validly chosen. The striker is entitled to play either ball of the side from where it lies in the first *stroke*.
- C28.8.4 An issue can arise for referees with both of these laws if the *striker* contravenes either of them and the opponent does not *forestall* before the first *stroke* but does so immediately after a *roquet* is made in that stroke. Had the opponent kept silent in the hope of a favourable outcome (a missed roquet), or had the opponent only just woken up? A referee appealed to will need to take into account how seriously (if at all) the opponent breached the Laws by failing to forestall in deciding how the situation should be resolved. In extreme circumstances, the overriding law (Law 63, in particular Laws 63.2.1 or 63.2.2) may need to be invoked.

C29 FAULTS

C29.1 **INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS** Faults are the most frequent category of *error* committed by players and give referees the most exercise. In view of the practical importance of faults, each of the 14 faults is covered separately.

C29.2 The change to the way accidental contacts between the *striker's* mallet and a ball (particularly but not only the *striker's ball*) are treated, described in paragraphs C8.3.1 and C8.3.2 above, and the consequential extension of the *striking period*, during which a fault can be committed, described in paragraphs C8.4 and C8.8 increase the likelihood of the striker committing faults when the *stroke* the striker is intending to play is a *critical stroke*. An accidental contact with the striker's ball in a critical stroke counts as the stroke, and will be a fault if, for example, the contact occurs by the bottom of the striker's mallet brushing the striker's ball. Likewise, the mallet accidentally contacting a ball that is neither the striker's ball nor the ball from which croquet is being taken will be a fault (since the stroke is then necessarily critical).

C29.3 Some of the actions described in Law 29.1 are not faults if they occur in certain types of *strokes* or at certain times during the *striking period* (the exemptions). Other actions are faults only if the adjudication of them meets certain standards (the limitations). These exemptions and limitations are spelled out in Law 29.2. The descriptions of the actions that constitute each fault, spelled out in Law 29.1, cross-reference any exemptions or limitations applicable to that action.

C29.4 For most faults, the action that constitutes the fault must be observed (seen and/or heard) by a referee, some other person adjudicating the *stroke*, or the *striker* for the stroke to be declared a fault. Two faults – those covered by Laws 29.1.6.2 and 29.1.7 – can be deduced to have occurred on the basis of how the ball(s) involved travel as a result of the stroke even though the action concerned may be neither seen nor heard. The court damage fault (Law 29.1.14) is unique in that it may be seen to occur but can in any case be deduced to have happened by the effect on the court surface, which can be inspected after the stroke has been played. It may also be necessary to test afterwards to see whether damage meets a threshold test for affecting subsequent strokes played over the damaged area.

C29.5 ACTIONS THAT CONSTITUTE FAULTS

As a precursor to commentary on the faults, it is worth noting that, as an aid to memorising them, the faults are organised into four distinct groups.

- C29.5.1 The first four faults, Laws 29.1.1 to 29.1.4, are unlawful methods of using the mallet.
- C29.5.2 The next five, Laws 29.1.5 to 29.1.9, are unlawful contacts between mallet and the *striker's ball*.
- C29.5.3 Then there are three faults, Laws 29.1.10 to 29.1.12, dealing with unlawful movements of balls, whether by mallet or the *striker's body* (including clothes).
- C29.5.4 The last two, Laws 29.1.13 and 29.1.14, are specialised faults – *croquet strokes* and substantial damage.

C29.6 LAW 29.1.1

'touches the head of the mallet with a hand, or slides the mallet along the *striker's* foot or leg to guide it (for exemptions see Laws 29.2.1 and 29.2.2)'

- C29.6.1 The second clause and the definition of *body* in the Laws glossary ban the use of the shoe to prevent the mallet hitting an obstacle (such as a hoop upright) instead of the ball in a *hampered stroke*. Accidental contact between mallet and the leg or foot may be painful but is not a fault; the fault is deliberately using them to guide the mallet.
- C29.6.2 The extension of the *striking period*, starting when the *striker* takes a stance with apparent intent to play a *stroke*, makes it desirable to make touching the head of the mallet a fault only if it occurs during the final swing of the mallet towards the ball. Touching the head of the mallet at other times (e.g. to clean mud from it) while in the stance and therefore within the striking period, but before swinging the mallet to hit the ball, is exempted (Law 29.2.1). Likewise, a fault is not committed under this law if the touching or sliding (plausibly only the former) occurs after the *striker* has completed the swing in which the *stroke* was played but before quitting the stance (Law 29.2.2). These exemptions are justified by the fact that they have no effect on the *stroke* about to be played or that has just been played.

C29.7 LAW 29.1.2

'rests the shaft of the mallet or a hand or arm on the ground, an *outside agency*, or any part of the *striker's* legs or feet (for exemptions see Law 29.2.2)'

- C29.7.1 The fault is to rest the shaft of the mallet, hand or arm on the ground, an *outside agency* or legs or feet, not merely to touch the ground or a leg, foot or shoe during the swing. The words 'an outside agency' are to counter any bright ideas of placing anything under the shaft etc. to circumvent the law. Note, however, that a hoop is not an outside agency and thus it is legal to rest the shaft of the mallet on or against a hoop. Note also that a hand brushing along the grass in a horizontal sweep shot is not a fault because it is not resting on the ground.
- C29.7.2 This law specifically makes it a fault if the *striker* plays a *stroke* one-handed and rests the other hand on a leg for bracing. The equivalent wording in the 6th Edition was open to different interpretations and the law has been made unambiguous on this point.
- C29.7.3 A fault is not committed under this law if the *striker* rests the shaft of the mallet or a hand or arm on the ground after completing the swing of the mallet in which the *stroke* is played but before quitting the stance (Law 29.2.2). The *striker* may legitimately rest a hand on the ground to assist in getting up from a crouched stance!

C29.8 LAW 29.1.3

'moves the *striker's ball* other than by striking it with the mallet audibly and distinctly'

- C29.8.1 This covers any ball movement brought about by anything other than a traditional *stroke*. Hitting a ball from the vertical and then sliding the mallet around the surface so that it can be pushed around an upright or another ball offends this sub-law – despite what some

ingenious players may think! So does placing the mallet immediately behind the ball when an obstructing hoop means the *striker* has no backswing and playing a stroke with a (silent) forward jab that does not produce a distinct impact.

C29.9 **LAW 29.1.4**

'causes or attempts to cause the mallet to strike the *striker's ball* by kicking, hitting, dropping or throwing the mallet'

C29.9.1 'Dropping' and 'throwing' prohibit letting go of the mallet completely. *Strokes* that involve holding on to the top of the shaft while releasing the mallet head to pivot freely are not faults under this sub-law.

C29.10 **LAW 29.1.5**

'strikes the *striker's ball* with any part of the mallet other than an end-face of the head in any of the *strokes* specified in Law 29.2.3'

C29.10.1 The *strokes* to which this fault applies are:

C29.10.1.1 a *hampered stroke*; or

C29.10.1.2 a *single-ball stroke* in which the *striker* is attempting to make the *striker's ball* jump; or

C29.10.1.3 a *stroke* in which the *striker's ball* is part of a *group*.

C29.10.2 Under the 6th Edition, this fault applied to a narrower range of *strokes*: essentially those covered by paragraph C29.10.1.1 above and some *cannons* covered by paragraph C29.10.1.3. The court damage fault (Law 29.1.14) covered most but not all of these strokes (see section C29.19 below). In the 7th Edition, these two types of faults cover the same range of strokes, which is all of the strokes covered by either law in the 6th Edition.

C29.10.3 The definition of a *hampered stroke* in the Laws glossary means it is a fault under this sub-law if the *striker* accidentally or deliberately mis-hits the *striker's ball* when the proximity of a hoop or the peg or, under certain circumstances, a ball hampers the swing of the mallet or impedes the *striker's* normal stance, requiring the *striker* to take special care in playing the *stroke*. See paragraphs G7 to G11 above for more detail on what constitutes hampering of a stroke.

C29.10.4 If the *striker* is faced with a *hampered stroke* because the normal swing of the mallet is impeded by a hoop, the peg, or another ball, the *striker* does not convert the *stroke* into an unhampered stroke by deliberately using any part of the mallet other than an end-face to strike the ball. The proximity of the obstacle is still requiring the *striker* to take special care over the stroke.

C29.10.5 Deliberate use of the edge of the end-face, or the side or shaft of the mallet in circumstances where Law 29.2.3 does not apply, is not explicitly a fault. It should nevertheless be penalised under the overriding law (Law 63) as a deliberate infringement of Laws 5.5.1 and 5.5.3 on the construction and use of the mallet, which require the mallet to have identical *playing characteristics* regardless of which end-face is used.

C29.10.6 *Hampering* due to the proximity of the *striker's ball* to a hoop applies to attempts to run the hoop from close range as well as to attempts to make a *roquet* after it has been run by too little. It does, however, depend on the *stroke* to be played. If the *striker's ball* is 2 inches (5 cm) from a hoop at an angle of 30 degrees and the *striker* attempts to run the hoop, the stroke is hampered by the proximity of the hoop. When the ball is in the same position, however, and the *striker* plays it past the hoop in a direction where the hoop causes no obstruction to the swing of the mallet, the passage of the ball, or the *striker's* stance, the stroke is not hampered by the hoop.

C29.10.7 The Law 29.1.5 fault applies to *single-ball strokes* in which the *striker* is attempting to make the *striker's ball* jump, but not *croquet strokes* played in a manner that causes the *striker's ball* to jump. It is common practice for players to play certain types of croquet strokes (for

example roll strokes) in such a manner, and there is no intention to make croquet strokes played in this way subject to this law.

C29.10.8 The Law 29.1.5 fault now covers all *cannons*. With certain types of cannons, the mallet is likely to strike the *striker's ball* more than once, and the striker's ball may even jump and be hit a second time by a part of the mallet other than the end-face. The fault of striking the ball with part of the mallet other than an end-face, covered by this law, applies only to the first contact. Any subsequent contact, however it occurs, is covered by Law 29.1.6.2 (multiple contacts between mallet and striker's ball) and the exemptions specified in Law 29.2.4 (see paragraph C29.20.2 below).

C29.11 **LAW 29.1.6**

'allows the mallet

29.1.6.1 to contact the *striker's ball* more than once in a *croquet stroke*, or *continuation stroke* when the striker's ball is touching another ball (for exemptions see Law 29.2.4 and for limitations see Law 29.2.5); or

29.1.6.2 to contact the *striker's ball* more than once in any other *stroke* (for exemptions see Law 29.2.4); or

29.1.6.3 to remain in contact with the *striker's ball* for an observable period in any *stroke* (for exemptions see Law 29.2.4 and for limitations see Law 29.2.6)'

C29.11.1 This sub-law covers both multiple and unduly prolonged contact between the mallet and the *striker's ball*. These are amalgamated partly in recognition of the difficulty in distinguishing between them. High speed photography shows that many *croquet strokes*, which to human senses are perfectly acceptable, have multiple contacts, and contact times considerably longer than *single-ball strokes*.

C29.11.2 To ensure that the game remains playable, a laxer standard is applied to *croquet strokes*, and to *continuation strokes* where the *striker's ball* is touching another ball. A fault may be declared under Law 29.1.6.1 only if an adjudicator or the *striker* sees a separation between the mallet and the striker's ball followed by the mallet hitting the striker's ball a second time (see Law 29.2.5). The principal target of this fault in croquet strokes is 'shepherding', namely guiding the striker's ball with the mallet in a hoop approach after the balls have parted contact, or very extreme pass rolls. "Dirty sounding" croquet strokes may be inelegant, but the striker gains no advantage from poor technique.

C29.11.3 In making the judgement described in paragraph C29.11.2 above, the adjudicator or the *striker* may be aided by nothing more than spectacles or contact lenses; slow-motion video recording, in particular, may not be used.

C29.11.4 A *croquet stroke*, or a *continuation stroke* in which the *striker's ball* is touching another ball, can be ruled to have been a fault under Law 29.1.6.3 if an adjudicator or the *striker* sees or hears a contact between the mallet and the striker's ball that is materially longer than the contact that necessarily occurs in a *stroke* of the same type. In making this judgement, the adjudicator or the *striker* may be aided by nothing more than spectacles, contact lenses or hearing aids.

C29.11.5 *Single ball strokes* can be faulted under Law 29.1.6.2 not only if multiple contacts between the mallet and the *striker's ball* can be seen or heard but also on the basis of the movement of the balls. (Law 29.2 imposes no limitation on how a fault under Law 29.1.6.2 may be judged.) It is well known that when two balls are a few centimetres apart and the striker's ball is driven at the other ball along the line joining their centres, the striker's ball will stop almost completely after hitting the second one, unless it is hit a second time by the mallet. Should the striker's ball not stop almost immediately, but instead travel an appreciable fraction of the distance travelled by the other ball, that is an indication that the mallet has hit the striker's ball more than once even if a second hit is not audibly distinguishable.

- C29.11.6 Law 29.2.4 provides exemptions from the Law 29.1.6.2 fault (and the closely related fault covered by Law 29.1.7) for a second contact (or more than two) between the mallet and the *striker's ball* for *roquets* and pegging-out. A very short rush, i.e. less than 2 inches (5 cm), can lead to the *striker's ball* being 'carried' forward by the mallet after the roquet has been made. A similar effect can be achieved during pegging out, whether in a *croquet stroke* or a *single-ball stroke*. In all cases, the policy of the Laws is not to penalise these accidents which are often unavoidable consequences of an essentially excellent previous *stroke*. Further consideration of the Law 29.2.4 exemptions is in section C29.20 below.
- C29.11.7 A scatter shot when the *striker's ball* lies very close to but not in contact with a *dead ball* does not benefit from the Law 29.2.4 exemption. Such a *stroke* may be (and often needs to be) faulted under Laws 29.1.6.2 or 29.1.7. Judging it is described in detail in section C29.12.
- C29.11.8 *Single ball strokes*, e.g. hammer strokes, can be faulted under Law 29.1.6.3 on the basis of sound that an adjudicator, assisted by nothing more than hearing aids, considers to be audibly prolonged compared to the sound of a normal *stroke* of the same type (Law 29.2.6).
- C29.11.9 Note that subsequent contact with any part of the mallet, not just the end-face, is a fault under Laws 29.1.6.1 or 29.1.6.2, subject to the exemptions listed in Law 29.2.4 (see paragraph C29.11.6 above and section C29.20 below).

C29.12 **LAW 29.1.7**

'allows the mallet to be in contact with the *striker's ball* after the *striker's ball* has hit another ball (for exemptions see Law 29.2.4 and for limitations see Law 29.2.7)'

- C29.12.1 The reason for this sub-clause is that if the two balls are very close together, say less than 2mm, but not actually touching, the mallet may still be in contact with the *striker's ball* when the *striker's ball* hits the nearby one. The *striker* could claim there was no multiple contact in breach of Law 29.1.6.2 nor was the contact observably long, in breach of Law 29.1.6.3, and a referee would find it impossible to decide. This plugs the gap by making it a fault if the mallet is still in contact with the *striker's ball* when the latter hits another ball. The same exemption for *roquets* applies as for Law 29.1.6.2 (see Law 29.2.4.1 and paragraph C29.11.6 above).
- C29.12.2 Close scatter shots will be faults under this law or Law 29.1.6.2 unless the *striker* is very careful. Law 29.2.7 allows a fault to be declared under Law 29.1.7 if the prolonged contact can be deduced solely from observing how far and in what directions the balls travel compared to what would be expected in a normal *stroke* where there was no possibility of such a prolonged contact. A multiple contact fault under Law 29.1.6.2 can be declared on the basis of the same observations. Thus, in a close scatter shot played along the line of the balls, there must have been prolonged contact and/or a multiple contact if the *striker's ball* continues forward a significant distance after the impact. Angled scatter shots will be faults if the angle between the directions travelled by the two balls is significantly less than it would have been if the balls had been further apart, which is normally close to a right-angle.
- C29.12.3 Law 29.1.7 does not normally apply to *croquet strokes*, since the *striker's ball* is not hitting another ball, unless there is a third ball nearby (including in a *cannon* involving a *dead ball*).

C29.13 **LAW 29.1.8**

'strikes the *striker's ball* so as to cause it to touch a hoop upright or, unless the *striker's ball* is pegged out in the *stroke*, the peg when in contact with the mallet'

- C29.13.1 This is the classic crush stroke but it is more difficult to commit than some referees appear to believe. A croquet ball remains in contact with a mallet end-face for a very short time, and somewhat paradoxically, does so for longer (in time, if not in distance) in gentle shots. The longest distance that mallet and ball will travel in contact with each other is about 1 cm (less than 0.5 inches). This does not mean that any ball within 1 cm from an upright is

therefore a candidate for a crush. What matters is the distance the ball travels between being struck and its first impact on the upright. In practice, unless the *striker* is so incompetent as to drive the *striker's ball* almost straight at the upright (in which case there will be a double tap anyway), this means that the nearest point of the ball must be within 1-2 mm of the upright before there is any real chance of a crush on that upright.

C29.13.2 The above analysis does not mean it is almost impossible to commit a fault in running a hoop when the ball starts out close to a hoop upright. There is a significant risk of a multiple contact fault under Law 29.1.6.2, even if the *striker* aims to avoid the nearer hoop upright, if the ball is slowed down by impacting a hoop upright (or by more than one such impact) and the mallet follows through towards the hoop after hitting the ball. The critical factors for a referee to take into account in adjudicating such a *stroke* are the direction in which the stroke is played, the manner in which the ball goes through the hoop (or fails to do so) and the extent to which the striker follows through after hitting the ball, with some guidance also provided by sound. The final direction in which the ball exits an angled hoop is a less reliable guide, as if no fault is committed it depends on whether there was an odd or even number of impacts between the ball and the uprights.

C29.14 **LAW 29.1.9**

'strikes the *striker's ball* when it lies in contact with a hoop upright or, unless the striker's ball is pegged out in the *stroke*, the peg otherwise than in a direction away therefrom'

C29.14.1 This is the easiest way to commit a crush but should occur only if the *striker* is ignorant of basic physics or tries to play close to the forbidden line and the referee believes the striker transgressed it. A referee can readily judge whether this fault occurs by watching carefully the direction of swing of the mallet as the ball is struck and checking that the ball moves away from the hoop upright or the peg in that direction. If its initial movement is in a different direction, even slightly, the hoop or the peg has contributed to the direction of travel of the ball and the *stroke* was a fault.

C29.15 **LAW 29.1.10**

'moves or shakes a *ball at rest* by hitting a hoop or the peg with the mallet or with any part of the *body*'

C29.15.1 The main instances are hitting a hoop or the peg in the backswing when a ball is in contact with it and hitting a hoop or the peg on the forward swing when aiming to hit a ball resting on it.

C29.16 **LAW 29.1.11**

'touches any ball, other than the *striker's ball*, with the mallet'

C29.16.1 With the extension of the start of the *striking period* introduced in the 7th Edition, the *striker* may be more likely to commit this fault, even if it is only while trying out what *stroke* may be possible when the *striker's ball* is in a *critical position* due to the presence of another ball.

C29.17 **LAW 29.1.12**

'touches any ball with any part of the *body*'

C29.17.1 Note the definition of *body* in the Laws glossary. It includes everything, other than the mallet or clips, being worn or carried by the *striker* at the start of a *stroke*. It is a fault if the striker's hat falls off during the *striking period* and hits a ball, even if it does not move it!

C29.17.2 The 7th Edition changes the way clips are treated: when they are carried by the *striker* they are not treated as part of the striker's *body* and a clip falling to the ground is treated as an *outside agency* (Law 5.4.4). No fault is committed, therefore, by a clip falling off the striker during the *striking period* and hitting a ball (as was the case under the 6th Edition).

C29.18 **LAW 29.1.13**

'in a *croquet stroke*, plays away from or fails to move or shake the croqueted ball'

C29.18.1 A fault is committed if the *striker* plays away from the croqueted ball even though it moves or shakes, as it may do if it was 'propped up' by the *striker's ball* on the edge of a depression.

C29.19 **LAW 29.1.14**

'in any of the *strokes* specified in Law 29.2.3, damages the court with the mallet, to the extent that a subsequent stroke played over the damaged area could be significantly affected.'

C29.19.1 The *strokes* to which this fault applies are:

C29.19.1.1 a *hampered stroke*; or

C29.19.1.2 a *single-ball stroke* in which the *striker* is attempting to make the *striker's ball* jump; or

C29.19.1.3 a *stroke* in which the *striker's ball* is part of a *group*.

C29.19.2 As described in paragraph C29.10.2 above, this fault applies to the same range of *strokes* as the fault of striking the ball with a part of the mallet other than an end-face. This is a slightly wider range of strokes than was the case under the 6th Edition, as it now includes strokes where the *striker's* stance, and not just the swing of the mallet, is *hampered* by a hoop, the peg, or an unrelated ball (see the definition of a *hampered stroke* in the Laws glossary).

C29.19.3 This sub-law is intended to deter the *striker* from damaging the court in situations where the risk of doing so could reasonably be decreased by playing the *stroke* differently. It does not cover damage caused in an otherwise unexceptional stroke of a different type, either as a result of a mis-hit or faulty technique. Repeated examples of damage in such strokes should be dealt with by coaching or warning after the game, or in persistent cases by sanction by the host club. Damage caused by temper or high spirits is also outside its scope (unless it occurs during the *striking period* after playing one of the strokes listed in paragraph C29.19.1 above).

C29.19.4 The damage must be caused by the mallet, not just the ball.

C29.19.5 The law does not specify an objective test as to whether a subsequent *stroke* played over the damaged area could be 'significantly affected', but it is explicit that it is the potential effect on subsequent strokes, rather than cosmetic appearance, that must be considered. The effect on gentle, as well as hard strokes, must be taken into account. The potential effect must be significant: the guidance offered is that damage significantly affects a stroke if a ball passing over the (unrepaired) damage, at a speed such that it will stop about a mallet's (shaft) length away, would come to rest more than a ball's width from where it would have done if the damage was not there. This deviation could be in distance as well as direction. This test may have to be relaxed on an uneven court.

C29.20 **EXEMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS** The exemptions and limitations listed in Law 29.2 are described in sections C29.6 to C29.19 above as part of the descriptions of the actions to which they apply.

C29.20.1 The exemptions listed in Law 29.2.4 for multiple contacts or prolonged contact between the *striker's ball* and the mallet, described in paragraphs C29.11.6 and C29.12.1 above, require further consideration.

C29.20.2 If a second contact or multiple contacts between mallet and ball are exempted under Law 29.2.4, that exemption applies to contact with any part of the mallet, not just the end-face. Thus it is not a fault if the *striker's ball* jumps in making a *roquet* and is then hit by the shaft of the mallet, but it would be if the *striker's ball* bounced off a hoop between making the roquet and being hit again by the mallet.

C29.20.3 The exemptions in Law 29.2.4 apply only to contacts between the mallet and the *striker's ball*, not any other ball. There is no exemption, for example, for any contact between the mallet and the croqueted ball even if it is pegged out in the *stroke* and rebounds onto the mallet.

C29.20.4 In the case of *roquets*, the exemption given by Law 29.2.4 is restricted by its last sentence. It is a fault if, after making a roquet, the *striker's ball* hits something else and then touches the mallet again. The objects referred to are hoops, the peg or another ball. The following examples, with R as the striker's ball and K as the second ball in each case, clarify this.

C29.20.4.1 Mallet hits R; mallet hits R a second time; R *roquets* K. This is a fault, as the second contact occurred before the roquet was made.

C29.20.4.2 Mallet hits R; R *roquets* K; R hits mallet. This is not a fault, as the exemption in Law 29.2.4.1 applies.

C29.20.4.3 Mallet hits R; R *roquets* K; R hits object; R hits mallet. This is a fault, as the last sentence of Law 29.2.4 means that the exemption in Law 29.2.4.1 does not apply.

C29.20.4.4 Mallet hits R; R *roquets* K; R hits mallet; R hits object. This not a fault, as the exemption in Law 29.2.4.1 applies. (Note that use of the tense "has hit", rather than "hits" or "goes on to hit", in the last sentence of Law 29.2.4 means that that sentence does not apply in this case, as there was no contact between the mallet and R after R hit the object.)

C29.20.4.5 Mallet hits R; R hits object; R *roquets* K; R hits mallet. This is not a fault, as the exemption in Law 29.2.4.1 applies. (The last sentence of Law 29.2.4 does not apply, as R hit the object before, rather than after, making the roquet.)

C29.20.5 Consider the case of the *striker* trying to run a hoop from close to, or even in the *jaws*, with another ball just behind the hoop. If the *striker's ball* is straight in front of (or in) the hoop, and the other ball is more than a ball's width clear of the *non-playing side*, then the striker can hit the striker's ball a second time after it has hit the other one with impunity, provided the striker's ball ends up having run the hoop, as Law 21.1 states that a *roquet* will have been made (and thus the exemption in Law 29.2.4.1 applies, as in example C29.20.4.2 above).

C29.20.6 If the other ball is closer to the hoop (but still clear of the *jaws*), there is a risk that the *striker's ball* will hit an upright after hitting that ball and a subsequent impact by the mallet will not then be exempted (example C29.20.4.3). This is very likely to be the case if the hoop is angled. If the hoop is not too angled, however, and the *striker* is careful, it is possible to play the *stroke* firmly with follow-through so that the mallet hits the striker's ball a second time to make sure it completes running the hoop. Because the stroke is hoop and roquet, it benefits from the Law 29.2.4.1 exemption as described in paragraph C29.20.5 above.

C29.21 REMEDY

C29.21.1 No point can be scored as the result of a fault or any subsequent *stroke in error* when the fault is *discovered* before the *limit of claims* (Law 29.3). In addition, the opponent has the right to choose whether the fault should be *rectified*, replacing the balls in the positions they occupied before the fault, or instead left in the positions they arrived at as a result of the *stroke* in which the fault was committed.

C29.21.2 The opponent's right to choose whether to *rectify* the fault removes any point to the *striker* placing a foot close to a hoop when trying to jump an angled hoop from a position that is wired from an enemy ball on the far side of the hoop, so that a failed attempt will cause the ball to hit the striker's foot. It likewise eases the conscience of a striker who declares a marginal fault when replacement of the balls would advantage the striker.

C29.21.3 Note the reference to Law 42.8 which, for handicap play, specifies the order of events if the *striker* has the option of taking a *half-bisque* or *bisque* and the opponent has the option of *rectification* (see paragraph C42.9 below).

C29.21.4 **REFEREEING CONSIDERATIONS** If the positions to which the balls may be replaced are *critical*, it is reasonable for their positions after the first *stroke in error* to be marked and for them to be provisionally placed where they were before the fault, to enable the opponent, who may not be aware of those positions, to assess the situation before deciding on *rectification*. Once that decision has been announced, however, the opponent may not then alter it.

C29.22 **FAULTS COMMITTED BY THE STRIKER'S PARTNER IN DOUBLES** In doubles, the *striker's partner* as well as the *striker* can commit certain types of faults. These are specified in Laws 45.3.2 and 48.3.2 and cross-referenced by Law 29.5. See also paragraphs C45.3.2 and C48.3 below.

C29.23 **STANDARD OF PROOF FOR JUDGING A FAULT** Law 29.6 specifies the standard of judgement that the *striker* or a referee or other person adjudicating a *stroke* must apply in deciding whether or not a fault was committed. A fault is to be declared if an adjudicator or the *striker* believes it more likely than not that the law was infringed. Thus the *striker* cannot get away with playing a *stroke* in such a manner that the referee is unable to determine for certain what went on; the *striker* can and should be faulted if the referee thought it more likely than not that it was unlawful.

SECTION D: INTERFERENCE WITH PLAY

C30 GENERAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING INTERFERENCES

C30.1 *Errors* and *interferences* are mutually exclusive and are governed by different principles. An error is a mistake made by the *striker* (or by the opponent mistakenly acting as the *striker*) in the playing of a *stroke* (see the introduction to Part B above for the analysis). An *interference* is an irregularity in play of a different type and takes one of three forms:

C30.1.1 a mistake by either player involving something other than playing a *stroke* incorrectly; or

C30.1.2 a disturbance of the game by an active factor unconnected with either player, otherwise known as an *outside agency*; or

C30.1.3 a disturbance of the game by a passive factor unconnected with either player.

C30.2 Additionally, these *interferences* fall into two categories:

C30.2.1 *Interferences* under Laws 31 to 33, which could affect several or even many *strokes*. Their *limit of claims* is the end of the game.

C30.2.2 *Interferences* under Laws 34 to 38, which generally affect just a single *stroke*. The *limit of claims* is either before the *stroke* is played (e.g. moving balls to avoid *special damage*), when the next *stroke* is played (when a ball in motion has been affected) or until subsequent play affects the relevant ball (when a *ball at rest* has been affected).

C30.3 **PLAYER MUST DECLARE** A player in the game is obliged to *forestall* play to draw attention to, or (in the case of the *striker*) to declare, any *interference* the player believes may have already affected play or will affect the *stroke* the *striker* is about to play. This obligation is unconditional and does not depend on whatever the *striker* may be about to do in the *stroke* about to be played.

C30.4 REMEDY FOR AN INTERFERENCE

C30.4.1 *Interferences* under Laws 31 to 33 are *redressed* by returning the game to the point where play was first affected by the interference and cancelling subsequent play. In some cases, the point to which play must revert may require adjudication – the players may have different opinions about when play was first affected and that may affect which side will be in play when play resumes (see paragraph C24.5.5 above for an example).

C30.4.2 The cancellation of play requires the balls to be returned to positions they lawfully occupied before the first affected *stroke*, and the clips returned to where they should have been at

that time. Responsibility for the positions of the balls reverts to what it then was (which may be a test of memory). In a time-limited game the time that has elapsed since the *interference* first affected play must be restored (it may be necessary to make a best guess!) while in handicap play any *bisques* taken after the point to which play reverts, including one taken to play the first affected stroke if relevant, are restored.

- C30.4.3 There are different possibilities for resuming play once *interferences* with a long *limit of claims* have been *redressed*. For interferences covered by Laws 31 and 33, the player who resumes play has a free choice as to the *line of play* to follow. When a player is granted a *replay* after being misled (Law 32), however, the player must follow a different line of play from what was attempted the first time. In all cases, if the first *stroke* affected by the interference was the first stroke of a turn, the player entitled to resume play may play either ball of the side that could lawfully have been played in that first stroke (or, in ordinary doubles, either player of the side may play the first stroke). In addition, if the player was entitled to a lift, contact or free placement under the laws governing wiring, advanced play or super-advanced play, the player may decide whether and how to exercise the available options.
- C30.4.4 Those *interferences* where the remedy is for the *striker* to *replay a stroke* (Laws 34, 35 and 38.2) require the *striker* to attempt a stroke with the same objectives as the first time.

C31 BALL WRONGLY REMOVED OR NOT REMOVED FROM THE GAME

C31.1 NATURE OF THE INTERFERENCE

- C31.1.1 It is important to appreciate that an *interference* under this law occurs only when play is first affected by the wrongful removal of a ball from the court when it has not been pegged out, or by a failure to remove a ball from the court when it has been pegged out. That point when play is first affected is usually, but not always, later than when the mistake of removing or not removing the ball occurred.
- C31.1.2 Play by either player could be affected by the *interference*, even if the player was the *striker* at the time it occurred. The law places no limitation on who may obtain *redress* as a result of the interference. Contrast that with playing when misled (Law 32), under which a player cannot get relief from that player's own mistakes.

C31.2 WHEN PLAY IS AFFECTED

- C31.2.1 Play is affected not only by a ball that should not be on the court being involved in a *stroke* (Law 31.2.1) but also (and probably earlier) by the wrongful presence or absence of a ball influencing the *striker's* decisions about the *line of play* to adopt and then following that line of play during a turn or at the start of a turn (Law 31.2.2). If it is clear that play has been affected by the wrongful presence or absence of a ball but it proves impossible to determine when any effect first occurred (usually because it was many strokes or even turns ago), the decision is that play was affected as soon as the ball was first *misplaced* (Law 31.2.3). A referee asked to assist with remedying this *interference* will probably need to ascertain the *striker's* intentions in determining when play was first affected as well as reconstructing the sequence of events around the time the mistake was made.
- C31.2.2 There may be situations where play is not affected by the wrongful presence of a ball on the court. For example, when a pegged-out ball has not been thrown completely clear of the court, or has rolled back onto it, provided no-one has attempted to involve it in subsequent play there is no need to waste time by taking the game back to the point when it ought to have been properly removed under Law 22.4.
- C31.2.3 It is just possible that a ball being wrongly removed from the court will not affect play. This would require *discovery* of the wrongful removal soon after the event, however, with any intervening *strokes* having been clearly unaffected by the absence of the ball.

- C31.2.3.1 **Example:** In a handicap game B, R and K are all for the peg and Y is for hoop 12 (rover). Bab is laid up near corner I with a cut rush for B on K to the peg. Roy shoots

with R at B and K from Corner III and hits the peg instead, bouncing off to near hoop 4. Roy forgets that he cannot peg out R until Y is a *rover ball* and knocks R off the court. Bab now rushes K accurately to the peg and pegs out K in the *croquet stroke*. Just as she is about to hit B onto the peg, Roy remembers that R should have remained on court. In these circumstances, a referee would be entitled to rule that R should be replaced but that Bab need not *replay* her turn and can complete the peg out. Had R finished near the peg, perhaps in between the peg and where K came to rest, a different decision would be appropriate.

C31.3 REMEDY AND LIMIT OF CLAIMS

- C31.3.1 The *interference* must be *redressed* as described above in section C30.4 if it is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game. Such a long *limit of claims* is necessary, as it is plausible for a mistake not to be discovered for some time, for example if the *striker* accidentally pegs out a *rover ball* when attempting to do something else and it is only very belatedly that one of the players appreciates the consequences of the ball hitting the peg.
- C31.3.2 Once the *interference* has been remedied, the player who is then entitled to play resumes play and may adopt any *line of play*.
- C31.3.3 While an *interference* under this law is being remedied, should an *error* under Laws 26 to 29 be *discovered* that was within its *limit of claims* at the time to which play must revert, Law 24.4 requires the error to be treated as though it had been discovered at that time. Its *rectification* may take play back to a still earlier time and produce a different situation from the one the players might expect. See paragraph C24.6.1.1 above for an example.

C32 PLAYER MISLED BY FALSE INFORMATION OR MISPLACED BALL OR CLIP

C32.1 **NATURE OF THE INTERFERENCE** This is one of the laws (Law 57 is the other) that demand Solomon-like powers of judgement from a referee. It deals with situations where a player claims that play has been affected by:

- C32.1.1 false information concerning the *state of the game* supplied by the player's opponent, a referee, or someone whom the players have authorised to act as timekeeper; or
- C32.1.2 the *misplacement* of a ball that has had its position interfered with by someone other than the player; or
- C32.1.3 the misplacement of a clip originally caused by someone other than the player.

C32.2 The player who may make such a claim need not be the *striker* of the current turn. It may well be that the *striker's* play causes the opponent to become aware of having been misled during a previous turn. Equally, some incident may prompt either player to realise that that player's play had earlier been affected by one of the causes listed in paragraphs C32.1.1 to C32.1.3 above.

C32.3 In the 7th Edition, the causes of misleading that may entitle a player to a *replay* have been extended to include false information concerning the *state of the game* provided by either a referee or someone authorised by the players to act as timekeeper (the latter limited in practice to advice about the time remaining in the game). The other causes are the same as in the 6th edition of the Laws.

C32.4 **WHEN PLAY IS AFFECTED** If a player claims to have been misled into a *line of play* that the player would not otherwise have adopted, the referee must judge the credibility of the player's claim as to when and how the misleading occurred. The player must be able to make a plausible case that if the correct situation had been known, the player would have played differently from a specific point in the course of previous play.

C32.5 While the *limit of claims* is the end of the game, the further back in time the misleading event is claimed to have been, the more convincing the evidence must be. While no hard and fast rule should be laid down, one would expect few claims to be allowed if they are based on having been misled more than two turns ago. The referee should also note the *line of play* adopted after a *replay* has been granted. It must be substantively different from the original and not just a minor variation designed to get a second bite at the cherry (see also section C32.8 below).

C32.6 The most potent historic claim one can imagine is from the player who has just learned from the opponent that, early in the game while the player was absent, the opponent accidentally *peeled* one of the player's balls but forgot to move the clip to the next hoop.

C32.7 REMEDY

C32.7.1 Following a successful claim by a player to have been misled, the *interference* is remedied in accordance with Law 30.3 by cancelling all play beyond the point where the player who was misled would first have played differently had the correct situation been known. Subject to Law 24.4, the player who was misled then resumes play and must adopt a different *line of play* from what the player did the first time. The reference to Law 24.4 in Law 32.5.2 means that if an earlier *error* is *discovered* while the interference is being remedied and that error was within its *limit of claims* at the point to which play reverts, then the error must be dealt with in accordance with its applicable law.

C32.7.2 The requirement that a player who was misled must follow a different *line of play* in a *replay* must be interpreted carefully by a referee (or the opponent if no referee is involved). The definition of the term *line of play* in the Laws glossary is not exhaustive. In addition, circumstances may arise that require interpretation.

C32.7.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy attempts to *roquet* his *partner ball* at the far end of the court. He misses, but when he gets there he finds that the partner ball is off the court. Double-bankers own up to having removed and not replaced it. Roy has a valid claim to have been misled and in the *replay* he may again attempt to roquet the partner ball. This counts as a different *line of play* because a roquet was impossible the first time.

C32.7.2.2 **EXAMPLE** Bab, playing K, attempts to get a rush on R but when she goes to take the rush a double banking player intervenes to say that R is *misplaced* because he had not replaced it after moving it to make way for his play. Once R is correctly placed the rush is worse. Bab is entitled to a *replay* and may again attempt to get a rush on R in its correct position, that counting as a different *line of play*.

C32.7.3 While a player is entitled to a *replay* after having been misled, the law does not make a replay compulsory if the player decides it is preferable not to replay. In the situation described in example C32.7.2.2 above, if the replacement of R in its correct position had made Bab's rush better rather than worse, she would have been entitled to continue from the improved position regardless of any objection from her opponent.

C32.7.4 If a player was misled and opts for a *replay*, play must resume from the point where the player would first have adopted a different *line of play*, not from some later time. The player might be confronted by several difficult *strokes* to begin the replay and might prefer to avoid those by restarting the turn from some later point. That is not permitted.

C32.8 **FAILURE TO ADOPT A DIFFERENT LINE OF PLAY IN A REPLAY** A referee who is asked to adjudicate a claim by a player to have been misled should watch how the player resumes play. It is up to the opponent, however, to intervene if the opponent believes the player fails to follow a different *line of play* in the *replay*. The referee has no right to intervene, the referee's role being limited to deciding any complaint made by the opponent. If an appeal is made and the referee is of the opinion that the player did not follow a different line of play in the replay, the player loses the right to the replay and the original play up to the point at which the player made the claim must be reinstated. All other aspects of the game affected by the now-annulled remedy (positions of clips, time elapsed, responsibility for positions of balls, *bisques* in handicap play) must also be restored to what they were when the claim was made. Should an earlier *error* have been *discovered* while the claim to have been misled was being handled and then annulled, that error must be treated as though it was discovered at the time the claim to have been misled was made. If its *limit of claims* had not passed at that time, it must be dealt with.

C33 USING A BALL THAT IS AN OUTSIDE AGENCY

C33.1 NATURE OF THE INTERFERENCE

- C33.1.1 This is a new law in the 7th Edition, but one covering a well-known problem. The *striker* strikes a ball that is an *outside agency* or introduces such an outside agency into the game in place of one of the other *balls in play* (Law 33.1.1). In the 6th Edition, this problem was covered in the commentary on the *wrong-ball* law, acknowledging, however, that it was not a case of playing the wrong ball and suggesting a remedy that is the basis of this new law.
- C33.1.2 All of the situations covered by Law 33 involve the *striker* playing a *stroke* that is invalid, in the sense that it includes a ball:
- C33.1.2.1 that does not belong to the game, including a ball that is part of the *double-banked game* (Law 33.1.1.1); or
 - C33.1.2.2 that will be part of the game but has not yet become a *ball in play* in accordance with Law 9.1 (Law 33.1.1.2); or
 - C33.1.2.3 that has been part of the game but has been pegged out and removed from the court (Law 33.1.1.3).

This invalid stroke may be followed by other strokes that may also be invalid in the same sense, or may be valid in the sense that they correctly involve only *balls in play*. All such play until the *interference* is *discovered* is covered by Law 33.

- C33.1.3 **EXAMPLE** Bab *roquets* R using K and both balls go off the court. Bab retrieves K and the Y from the adjacent court, placing Y on the *yard-line* where R went off the court. Using K, she *takes croquet* from Y and then discovers there are two yellow balls on the court. The *interference* is remedied in accordance with Law 33.4 by restoring Y to its rightful owner, retrieving R and correctly taking croquet from it.
- C33.1.4 **EXAMPLE** Bab begins a 3-ball break on the third turn of the game playing K. After hoop 4, she *roquets* R and K goes off the court near Y, which has not yet been played into the game. Bab collects Y instead of K and, using Y, *takes croquet* from R. Roy intervenes to point out that Bab is playing his ball. This is an *interference* covered by Law 33 (not a case of playing the *wrong ball*— see Law 27.1.2). R is replaced where it was before the *croquet stroke*, Y is removed from the court and Bab resumes her break using K and taking croquet from R.
- C33.1.5 **EXAMPLE** At the beginning of Roy's turn, he prepares to strike Pink with the object of *roqueting* B. Bab should *forestall* the *stroke* under Law 23.2.2 (an *interference* is about to occur), and the players from the *double-banked game* may also intervene to avoid disruption to their game. Should Roy's mistake be *discovered* after he has played the stroke, the interference is remedied in accordance with Law 33.4. Pink, and any other ball moved by the stroke, is replaced and Roy can then choose how to begin his turn properly.
- C33.1.6 **PLAY NOT COVERED BY LAW 33** Law 33.1.2 makes it explicit that Law 33 does not apply to a situation where the *striker* correctly plays the *striker's ball* but attempts to "roquet" a ball from a game that is *double-banked* on the striker's court. Law 33 also does not apply if the striker validly plays a *croquet stroke* with the intention of "roqueting" a ball from the double-banked game in the next *stroke*. Such misguided strokes are valid, albeit pointless, and the striker gets no relief from the self-deception.
- C33.1.7 **EXAMPLE** At the beginning of Roy's turn, he prepares to strike R with the apparent intention of *roqueting* Brown, some metres away. This is not an *interference* covered by Law 33. Roy is about to play a valid *stroke* and it may not be evident whether he is attempting to "roquet" Brown or is instead intending to send R past Brown to some position. There is no requirement on Bab to *forestall*, though the players from the *double-banked game* may nevertheless intervene and cannot reasonably be prevented from doing so. If R hits Brown, an interference covered by Law 34 has occurred but there is no *replay* because

the conditions specified in Law 34.2.1 are not met. Brown is replaced and R is placed where it would otherwise have come to rest had it not hit Brown.

- C33.1.8 **EXAMPLE** During Roy's turn playing R, he plays a take-off from Y with the evident purpose of getting a rush on Green. Just as he is about to play the rush he realises the situation and stops play. No *interference* has occurred (though an interference under Law 34 is about to occur). Roy is entitled to continue his turn by playing R from its current position near Green, but Law 33 gives him no relief from having played the pointless take-off from Y.

C33.2 **INADVERTENT BALL SWAP**

- C33.2.1 It may happen that the *striker* inadvertently swaps a ball of the game with another ball of the same colour and type while both are off the court. A *stroke* involving the swapped ball is invalid in the sense defined in paragraph C33.1.2 above, but it looks like a valid stroke. The swap may be less readily *discovered* than other instances of involving an *outside agency* ball in play – the rest of the game may even be played without the mistake becoming evident. Law 33.2 acknowledges this situation by specifying that if the striker inadvertently swaps balls in this way and the swap is subsequently discovered, play in the striker's game is not affected by the swap. The swap may simply be reversed, with play then continuing in the usual way.
- C33.2.2 Any *error* that may be *discovered* while the inadvertent swap is being reversed, or during subsequent play, must be handled, as usual, in accordance with its applicable law. In determining whether the error is within its *limit of claims*, play that occurred while the swapped ball was included in the game must be taken into account, because that play remains validly part of the game. Any error for which the limit of claims has passed must be dealt with, as usual, in accordance with Law 25.5 (discovery after limit of claims).
- C33.2.3 When a ball swap occurs, play in the game from which the ball was swapped is likely to be affected. If so, Laws 33.3 and 33.4 will need to be applied to it.
- C33.2.3.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab, playing K on court 2, sends R as a pioneer to hoop 3 in the early stages of her break. Roy, playing on court 1 and using R, causes his R to go onto Bab's court. Roy retrieves the wrong R and continues his turn. Bab does not notice what Roy has done. Bab finds R somewhat further from hoop 3 than she remembered having placed it, but continues to play. She fails to get position at hoop 3 and stops to consult the opponent and a referee. They sort out what had happened. The play in Roy's game has not been affected and it is acceptable for the inadvertent swap of the Red balls to be reversed and for Roy to continue his turn (Law 33.2 applies). That is not true for Bab, however. Her play has been affected and the *interference* must be remedied by returning the play to where she began to prepare to use R for hoop 3 – most likely shortly after or before running hoop 2 (Laws 33.3 and 33.4 apply). She resumes her turn from that point with her R reinstated in its correct position.

C33.3 **WHEN PLAY IS AFFECTED** Except for instances of inadvertent ball swap covered by Law 33.2, play is affected by the inclusion of an *outside agency* ball in the game from the first *stroke* in which it is involved, or as soon as its presence influences the *striker's* play. For example, that may be when the striker directs play towards involving the outside agency as a *ball in play*, which may be several strokes before the *striker's ball* first hits it (Law 33.3).

C33.4 **REMEDY AND LIMIT OF CLAIMS WHEN PLAY IS AFFECTED**

- C33.4.1 Once an *interference* under Law 33.3 has been *discovered* it must be *redressed* in accordance with Law 30.3. The game is returned to the point when play was first affected and the player then entitled to play resumes play from that point. The *limit of claims* for the interference is the end of the game. Fortunately, in most instances, the interference will be discovered quite quickly (two Black balls and no Yellow ball on a court, for instance, or as in the example in paragraph C33.2.3.1 above). In other circumstances the interference may

not be discovered at all (swapping two balls of the same colour and type, whether or not in accordance with Law 33.2, but with the swap not significantly affecting either game's play).

- C33.4.2 As is the case with the *interferences* covered by Laws 31 and 32, if an *error* under Laws 26 to 29 is *discovered* in the course of remedying the *outside agency* interference and the error is within its *limit of claims* at the point to which the interference causes play to revert, the error must be dealt with in accordance with its law. Any error for which the limit of claims had passed at that point must be dealt with in accordance with Law 25.5.

C34 OUTSIDE AGENCY OR A PLAYER INTERFERING WITH A BALL DURING A STROKE

C34.1 NATURE OF THE INTERFERENCE

- C34.1.1 This law now covers only cases where an *outside agency* or a player, other than the *striker* during the *striking period*, touches a ball during a *stroke*. Other parts of the equivalent law in the 6th Edition have been moved elsewhere, including interference by natural forces (moved to Law 37) and a ball being moved between strokes (moved to Law 36). Sub-laws about avoiding predictable *interference* by an outside agency and dealing with *loose impediments* have been added.

- C34.1.2 The *striker* touching a ball during the *striking period* is a fault covered by Law 29, not an *interference* under this law.

C34.2 REMEDY

- C34.2.1 A *stroke* during which a ball suffers *interference* by an *outside agency*, or by someone other than the *striker* during the *striking period*, must be *replayed* when three conditions are all met, with an additional condition specified in Law 34.4 applying to *croquet strokes*. The three conditions are (Law 34.2.1):

C34.2.1.1 no further *stroke* has been played; and

C34.2.1.2 the *interference* might have prevented something significant happening, namely a point being scored, a *roquet* being made or a ball coming to rest in a *critical position*; and

C34.2.1.3 the *interference* was caused by the opponent, or by an *outside agency* that was in a different position (whether moving or at rest) from where it had been at the start of the *stroke*, so that the *striker* could not reasonably have anticipated the interference.

- C34.2.2 The first of the three conditions imposes a *limit of claims* – when the next *stroke* is played. It is not acceptable, however, for the *striker*, realising that *interference* has occurred but not wanting to *replay*, deliberately to play another stroke to avoid the replay. The striker is obliged to cease play by Law 30.2 (player must declare an interference).

- C34.2.3 The second condition, that something significant might have happened had the *interference* not occurred, must be interpreted to mean more than just a theoretical or outside chance. The condition is met if the *striker* thought B was heading toward R, even if it was still some distance away. By contrast, it is not sufficient to claim, when it appeared that B was going to miss R, that a worm cast or gust of wind might have deflected it on. The condition is also met if the striker believed a ball was about to score a peg point or a *hoop point* when it was interfered with. It may be difficult to determine if interference prevented a hoop point from being scored, but the phrasing of the law "might have prevented a point being scored" suggests a generous interpretation if there is interference with a ball when it is about to run (or attempt to run) its hoop.

- C34.2.4 The final part of the second condition, the likelihood of a ball coming to rest in a *critical position*, may also be difficult to judge. It includes cases where the *striker* is playing for a wired position or a rush or attempting to get the *striker's ball* into position to run a hoop. Again, purely theoretical chances should be ignored. See also the analysis of different cases in paragraph C34.6.1 below.

C34.2.5 The final condition for a *replay* is that the *interference* was by the opponent or (more likely) an *outside agency* that was in a different position from where it had been when the *striker* began the *stroke*. If a ball that is an outside agency is not moving before a stroke, the striker is required by Law 34.6.1 to mark and remove it if it might affect play. This means that the most common time there will be a replay is when moving balls from different games collide, but it is also plausible for an outside agency ball to come to rest in an interfering position as the striker is playing the stroke.

C34.2.6 Note that the point or *roquet* prevented by *interference* does not have to be one intended by the *striker*.

C34.2.6.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy attempts to run a hoop hard with R but plays the *stroke* badly. R bounces off the hoop and is about to hit a *live* K some distance away when it collides with a moving Green. All of the conditions for a *replay* are met, and Roy must replay the stroke with the same objectives (i.e. to run the hoop, though he is not obliged to try to run it hard). On the other hand, if Green had been stationary near K when Roy played the hoop attempt and Green had prevented the likely *roquet* of K, Roy is not entitled to a replay, as the third condition, set out in Law 34.2.1.3, is not met. Both R and K would then be placed in positions where it is estimated they would have stopped if Green had not interfered, acknowledging the difficulty of determining those positions.

C34.2.7 The additional condition applicable to *croquet strokes* is that Law 34.4 requires the turn to end with no *replay* if either ball would have gone off the court in circumstances that end the turn had it not been *interfered* with. The turn does not end, however, just because interference causes a ball to leave the court.

C34.2.8 While Law 34.2.1 specifies three conditions for a *replay*, with an additional one for *croquet strokes*, there is implicitly one more. This covers situations when an *error* is committed in the *stroke* interfered with (for example, the *striker* plays an unlawful croquet stroke involving a *live ball* and *interference* occurs during the stroke) or an error had already occurred in an earlier stroke and was still within its *limit of claims*. Both situations are covered by Law 24.3, and in each case the error occurred first, requiring it to be dealt with first. In both situations, *rectifying* the error would result in a stroke (or more than one) being cancelled, removing the need to deal with the interference (Law 24.3.4).

C34.2.8.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab *roquets* R with K but places K in contact with a *live* Y and plays a *croquet stroke*, attempting to send K to hoop-running position. A moving Green collides with K when it is still unclear whether K will stop in a position from which the hoop could be run. Bab then realises that she should have *taken croquet* from R. No turn-ending event has occurred, so Bab resumes her turn by taking croquet correctly from R. The cancellation of the unlawful croquet stroke nullifies the *interference*.

C34.3 REMEDY: REPLAYING THE STROKE

C34.3.1 If the conditions specified in Law 34.2.1 are all met, the *striker* must *replay* the same *stroke* with the same objectives. (This is a more explicit prescription for the replay than in previous Editions of the Laws.) The replay is not optional, and the striker may not attempt something different in the replay, though that does not require an exact replica of the original stroke in the replay. The objectives of the stroke include doing something specific with the *striker's ball* (making a *roquet*, running a hoop, sending it to a particular position etc.) and, if the stroke is a *croquet stroke*, positioning the croqueted ball for some purpose.

C34.3.2 When a *replay* is required, it is implicit that any ball moved by the *stroke* interfered with must be replaced to a position that was lawful before that stroke, while any points scored, *roquets* made, *deadness* incurred and responsibility for position taken in the stroke are cancelled. If the stroke interfered with was played from a *baulk-line* after the *striker* had lawfully taken a lift, the obligation to replay the same stroke with the same objectives means that the striker must repeat the lift shot from essentially the same place on the baulk-line as the first time.

C34.4 FAILURE TO ATTEMPT THE SAME STROKE IN A REPLAY If the *striker* is required to *replay a stroke* but does not attempt the same stroke with the same objectives in the replay, Law 34.3 gives the opponent the choice of accepting the outcome of the replay or requiring the striker to replay the original stroke again. This is a new law in the 7th Edition, clarifying what is required in a replay (something that previously was open to different interpretations).

C34.5 REMEDY: HOW PLAY CONTINUES WHEN A REPLAY IS NOT PERMITTED

C34.5.1 If any of the conditions for a *replay* in Law 34.2.1 is not met, no replay is permitted and the balls must be placed as near as can be judged to where they would have come to rest (acknowledging that there may be considerable uncertainty about that).

C34.5.2 When a ball suffers *interference* under Law 34.1 but there is no *replay*, any point that the ball scores or *roquet* that the ball is involved in (by making the roquet or being roqueted) before the interference stands. After interference, however, the ball interfered with may not score a point, nor make a roquet nor be roqueted during the *stroke*, even if the players agree that the point or the roquet was inevitable (see Law 34.2.2).

C34.5.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab, playing B, runs hoop 3 hard. After running the hoop, B hits Green, which was stationary in that position before the *stroke* started. The collision probably prevents B from hitting R but Green deflects B onto K. There is no *replay*, because the interfering ball (Green) was stationary before the stroke. The *hoop point* for B counts, but B does not make a *roquet*. K (and Green) must be replaced where they were before the stroke and both R and B must be placed where it is estimated they would have stopped had Green not prevented B from hitting R. It will likely be possible to determine only a very broad range of positions where they would plausibly have come to rest. Unexceptional positions (ones that do not particularly favour either side) within those ranges should be agreed between the players, perhaps in consultation with a referee or spectators. If the players hold different opinions of where the balls should be placed, their disagreement should be resolved in accordance with Law 55.6 (when the players' opinions differ), noting that because Bab failed to mark Green before the stroke was played she is the "offender" in terms of Law 55.6.1.

C34.5.2.2 **EXAMPLE** Bab plays a *croquet stroke* in which she makes a long-distance *peel* but the *striker's ball* suffers *interference* for which there is no *replay*. The peel counts, regardless of whether the interference with the striker's ball occurred before or after the peeler ran the hoop, as the interference was with the striker's ball, not the peeler and the second sentence of Law 34.2.2 therefore does not apply.

C34.6 ADJUDICATING MORE DIFFICULT CASES

C34.6.1 Adjudication, usually by a referee, will be required to deal with *interference* with a ball when the interference might have prevented the ball from going out or in situations such as when the ball might have hit a hoop. The referee should choose a position neutral to the interests of both sides within the area in which the ball could plausibly have come to rest, given the evidence available. Usually this will be the central point of that area, unless that position is particularly favourable or disadvantageous to one side compared with plausible adjacent positions. If the chosen position turns out to be a *critical position*, the other conditions for a *replay* in Law 34.2.1 must be checked and it may be that a replay will be required after all.

C34.6.2 If the result of an adjudication of the position of a ball interfered with in a *croquet stroke* is that the chosen position is off the court, Law 18.7 (ball off court ending turn) must be applied. If Law 18.7 requires the turn to end, then that is the outcome and the ball is lined in from where it would have gone off, whether or not it actually went off following the *interference*. Conversely, if the chosen position is on the court, the turn continues even if the ball was deflected over the *boundary* as a result of the interference.

C34.6.2.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy, playing Y, plays a long take-off from R down a *yard-line* to B and K. Roy aims a yard infield from B and K, but Y begins to curve out towards the *boundary*. Roy fears that Y may go off the court, but it collides with Brown, which was stationary

on the yard-line a few yards short of B and K and which Roy had not bothered to mark and remove. The collision deflects Y back infield and it stops on the court. The players request adjudication. A referee tests the line and concludes that the slope is such that Y would inevitably have gone off the court, given the distances Y and Brown travelled after the collision. Roy's turn ends with Y placed on the yard-line nearest to where the referee judges it would have left the court.

C34.6.2.2 **EXAMPLE** Bab, playing K, takes off from B to R and Y at the far end of the court. K travels parallel to the side *yard-line* but a yard or so in from it. The *stroke* is played harder than Bab intended, but she is hopeful K will not go off the court at the far end. K collides with a stationary Brown when it is a few yards short of R and Y and gets deflected over the side *boundary*. The players request adjudication. A referee concludes that K was most unlikely to have gone off the side boundary had the collision not occurred but would instead have stopped somewhere between a point a little over the far boundary and a point about two yards infield. The mid-point of that range is on the court, so Bab is permitted to continue her turn with K placed on that point.

C34.6.3 When there is no question of a *replay*, purely speculative collisions after *interference* should be ignored. There will be instances, however, when the ball interfered with would inevitably have hit a hoop had the interference not occurred. If it would have hit the hoop at speed, but the interference was far enough away to make it uncertain where it would have bounced off to, it should be placed on the *yard-line* in a neutral position, possibly midway between the intended line and the maximum likely deflection. At the other extreme, if a ball just trickles up to and contacts a double-banked ball stuck in a hoop, it may be reasonable to place the ball close to the hoop and wired from much of the court or even in the *jaws*. In each case it is a matter of assessing the range of positions where the ball could plausibly have ended, had it not been interfered with, and choosing one that gives neither side a gratuitous advantage.

C34.6.4 **PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS** A *striker* seeing a collision between the *striker's ball* and one from a *double-banked game* should immediately mark as accurately as possible the point where the collision occurred and the direction the *striker's ball* was travelling. The *striker* should also mark where both balls actually came to rest. This will assist in remedying the *interference* to both games.

C34.7 **FAILURE TO CORRECT THE POSITION OF A BALL AFTER INTERFERENCE** Law 34.5 deals with cases where the requirement to place or replace a ball after *interference* has not been met before the start of the next *stroke*, probably because the players are unaware of the interference. The ball is *misplaced* and Law 28 (playing when a ball is misplaced, particularly Law 28.2) applies to subsequent play. Under Law 28.2.6, the ball remains misplaced until its position is corrected or it is moved by subsequent play. If a player who involves the ball in play while it is misplaced is misled by the misplacement and is not the player who caused it, the player may have a claim under Law 32 to have been misled.

C34.8 **AVOIDING INTERFERENCE BY AN OUTSIDE AGENCY**

C34.8.1 Law 34.6.1 imposes a duty on the *striker* to remove an *outside agency* if it might affect play. By failing to do so, the *striker* will lose the opportunity for a *replay* if a collision does occur, and if the players disagree as to where a ball interfered with would have come to rest, Law 55.6.1 will have to be applied, with the *striker* as the "offender".

C34.8.2 By leaving the *outside agency* in place, the *striker* is acknowledging that it will not interfere with a successful *stroke* or that a collision dealt with under Law 34.2.2 would not have a material effect on the game (e.g. a double banking ball might interfere with the *striker's ball* after it had made a *roquet* and was about to become a *ball in hand*).

C34.9 **DEALING WITH LOOSE IMPEDIMENTS** *Loose impediments* are not considered *outside agencies* (Law 34.6.2 and the Laws glossary) to prevent unverifiable claims for *replays* of missed *roquets* due to deflections caused by pebbles, twigs, acorns etc. The *striker* is entitled to remove loose

impediments at any time (but may be penalised for wasting time by implausibly and repeatedly doing so). Loose impediments must be removed if they are likely to benefit the striker in the *stroke* about to be played. For example, the striker may not leave conveniently located detritus near a *boundary* when it could serve as a backstop, protecting the *striker's ball* from going off the court in a short take-off. The exceptional circumstances referred to in the last sentence of Law 34.6.2 cover such unforeseeable events as pebbles or other material being thrown onto the court and affecting the course of a ball.

C35 **OUTSIDE AGENCY OR OPPONENT INTERFERING WITH THE PLAYING OF A STROKE**

C35.1 **NATURE OF THE INTERFERENCE**

C35.1.1 This is another law that is more limited in scope than the equivalent law in the 6th Edition. It covers only an *outside agency* or the opponent interfering with the playing of a *stroke* and having a material effect on the outcome. It includes the *striker* being put off by the opponent *forestalling* at the wrong time in breach of Law 23.4, the opponent or someone else brushing past the striker during a stroke, a projectile (notably a stray ball) hitting the striker and all other accidents that might have a material effect on the outcome of the stroke.

C35.1.2 The parts of the 6th Edition law dealing with *interference* by fixed obstacles, changes of level and *special damage* have been moved to Law 37 (interference by natural forces or features of the court and its surroundings).

C35.2 **REMEDY**

C35.2.1 If the *interference* is *discovered* (as would be expected) before another *stroke* is played, the balls are replaced in their lawful positions before the stroke was played and the *striker* must *replay* the same stroke with the same objectives (see paragraph C34.3.1 above for a description of a stroke's objectives).

C35.2.2 This is the second of three laws for which the 7th Edition limits what the *striker* may do in a *replay*. The others are Law 34.2 (*outside agency* or a player *interfering* with a ball during a *stroke*), and Law 38.2 (stroke affected by incorrect hoop width or misshapen ball). In each case, the wording of the law in the 6th Edition provided scope for different interpretations of what is permitted in a replay.

C35.3 **FAILURE TO ATTEMPT THE SAME STROKE IN A REPLAY** If the *striker* is required to *replay* a *stroke* under Law 35.2 but does not attempt the same stroke with the same objectives in the replay, the opponent has the choice of accepting the outcome of the replay or requiring the striker to replay the original stroke again (Law 35.3).

C36 **INTERFERENCE WITH A BALL BETWEEN STROKES**

C36.1 The major parts of this law (Laws 36.2 to 36.5) impose new restrictions on what the *striker* may do in a *stroke* after having interfered with a ball between strokes. Such *interference* attracted no penalty under previous Editions of the Laws.

C36.2 **BALL MOVED BY NATURAL FORCES, OUTSIDE AGENCY OR PLAYER WHO IS NOT THE STRIKER** A ball that moves between *strokes* or is unlawfully moved between strokes by an *outside agency* or a player in the game other than the *striker* must be replaced in its lawful position. There are no other consequences.

C36.3 **STRIKER INTERFERING WITH THE STRIKER'S BALL**

C36.3.1 If the *striker* unlawfully moves the *striker's ball* between *strokes* by touching it with the mallet or the striker's *body*, the ball must be replaced. The next stroke the striker plays may then be subject to the restriction specified in Law 36.2.2. The same applies if, before starting the first stroke of a turn, the striker unlawfully moves a ball that the striker subsequently chooses as the striker's ball for that turn.

C36.3.2 **RESTRICTION ON THE NEXT STROKE** In each case, the restriction on the next *stroke* is that if it is a *single-ball stroke*, the *striker* may not play any *critical stroke* but may otherwise continue the turn (Law 36.2.2).

C36.3.3 **EXEMPTIONS** The *striker* is at times required to reposition the *striker's ball* between *strokes* in accordance with these Laws; that is not interference and is not subject to this law. In addition, the restriction on the next stroke does not apply if the ball interfered with:

C36.3.3.1 had already been marked by a referee or by one of the players to their joint satisfaction (Law 36.3.1); or

C36.3.3.2 is one the *striker* is entitled to lift or move temporarily under Law 5.3.2 (to wipe it, avoid interference or exchange it if faulty) and its original position had already been marked if it would have to be replaced in that position (Law 36.3.2); or

C36.3.3.3 is moved in an emergency, even if its position has not been marked, to avoid it being hit or moved by an *outside agency* (Law 36.3.3).

C36.3.4 **RATIONALE** The rationale for preventing the *striker* from playing a *critical stroke* after having interfered with the *striker's ball* before a *single-ball stroke* is that it cannot be guaranteed that the ball will be replaced accurately in its lawful position, potentially affecting the difficulty of a critical stroke. The situation is analogous to the one described in paragraph C8.3.4 above, where the *striker* accidentally contacts the *striker's ball* and then may not play a critical stroke as the next *stroke*. Both restrictions are imposed for the same reason.

C36.3.4.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy has only just run a hoop with R and faces a short *roquet* on Y made difficult by the hoop *hampering* his backswing (a *critical stroke*). While walking around to see what is possible, Roy accidentally moves R with his mallet. R is replaced, but Roy may no longer attempt the critical stroke on Y. He has an unobstructed shot at B on a distant *boundary* which he is still entitled to attempt but he chooses not to do so.

C36.4 **STRIKER INTERFERING WITH ANOTHER BALL**

C36.4.1 If the *striker* unlawfully moves a ball other than the *striker's ball* between *strokes*, or unlawfully moves a ball before starting the first stroke of a turn and that ball is not chosen as the *striker's ball* for that turn, the ball must be replaced and the next stroke the *striker* plays may again be subject to a restriction (Law 36.2.3). The restriction is that if the next stroke is a *single-ball stroke*, the *striker* may not play a *critical stroke* that would involve that ball, but may otherwise continue the turn.

C36.4.2 **EXEMPTIONS** The restriction on the next *stroke* does not apply when the *striker* is required to reposition the ball in accordance with these Laws nor in the circumstances described in paragraphs C36.3.3.1 to C36.3.3.3 above.

C36.4.3 **RATIONALE** The rationale for this restriction is analogous to that described in paragraph C36.3.4 above: it cannot be guaranteed that the ball interfered with will be replaced accurately, potentially affecting the difficulty of a *critical stroke* involving it.

C36.4.3.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab has only just run a hoop with K and her short *roquet* on R is difficult due to obstruction by the hoop (it is a *critical stroke*). While walking around to see what is possible, Bab accidentally knocks R. R is replaced but Bab may no longer attempt to roquet R, even if she has no other open shot and cannot even send K close to B.

C36.4.4 **NO RESTRICTION ON A CROQUET STROKE** No restriction is imposed if the next *stroke* is a *croquet stroke*, including when the ball interfered with is the one from which the *striker* is about to *take croquet*. It is not reasonable to impose a penalty if the *striker* accidentally moves a ball while placing the *striker's ball* in contact with it for a croquet stroke.

C36.5 **DETERMINING WHETHER A STROKE IS A CRITICAL STROKE** If the *striker* interferes with any ball between *strokes*, whether the next stroke the *striker* intends to play is a *critical stroke* is

something the players must decide or, failing that, be adjudicated by a referee (Law 36.4). If the situation is considered to be borderline, the ruling is that the stroke is critical.

C36.6 **STRIKER ATTEMPTING A CRITICAL STROKE FOLLOWING INTERFERENCE**

- C36.6.1 If the *striker* appears to be about to play a *critical stroke* that Laws 36.2.2 or 36.2.3 do not permit, the opponent is entitled to *forestall* play and ask a referee to adjudicate (Law 36.5.1).
- C36.6.2 If the *striker* plays a *critical stroke* in breach of Laws 36.2.2 or 36.2.3, the opponent can ask a referee to adjudicate and the overriding law (Law 63) may be invoked (Law 36.5.2). The striker has breached a law for which no penalty is prescribed and under Laws 63.2 and 63.3 the referee may impose an appropriate penalty. See paragraph C63.3.2 below for an example.

C37 **INTERFERENCE BY NATURAL FORCES OR FEATURES OF THE COURT AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

C37.1 **NATURAL FORCES**

- C37.1.1 Weather is treated as a natural force rather than an *outside agency* to prevent claims for *replays* of missed *roquets* due to gusts of wind (common in parts of New Zealand) or squalls of rain. Should wind, gravity or other natural forces cause a *ball at rest* to move, it must be replaced if it is not affected by the *stroke* and there is no other remedy.
- C37.1.2 If a ball moved by natural forces during a *stroke* is then affected by the stroke, the outcome stands. For example, if a *live ball* is blown into the path of the *striker's ball* and is *roqueted* as a result, the roquet counts. If a *ball at rest* is blown through its *hoop in order* during a stroke, however, the point does not count. The ball must be replaced if it is not affected by the stroke.
- C37.1.3 Puddles are likewise not considered to be *outside agencies*, but extreme events such as weather-related or other flash floods or dollops of snow falling onto the court (admittedly rare in a summer game, but not unknown to hardy croquet players in Scotland) would be.

C37.2 **FIXED OBSTACLES AND CHANGES OF LEVEL**

- C37.2.1 If the *striker* is about to play a *stroke* when the *striker's ball* is close to the *boundary*, a fixed obstacle such as a wall or a change of level outside the court, including a gradual slope up or down, may affect the swing of the mallet or the striker's stance. In that event, the striker must consult in accordance with Law 55.3 (asking a referee to adjudicate or consulting the opponent) and is then entitled to move the striker's ball sufficiently to ensure that neither the striker's normal swing nor stance is affected by the obstacle or level change (Law 37.2).
- C37.2.2 When the *striker* moves the *striker's ball*, Law 37.4 requires the striker to move any other ball that could foreseeably be affected by the next *stroke* to maintain their relative positions. Usually, this means by the same amount and in the same direction. This is not just a ball that the striker may be about to *roquet* but potentially also any other ball in the vicinity that might be impacted. A ball in a *critical position* with respect to the stroke the striker is about to play, however, should normally not be moved.
- C37.2.3 A ball moved to maintain a positional relationship with the *striker's ball* but not affected by the *stroke* must be replaced as soon as it is no longer relevant to the *striker's line of play*, a deliberately wide term that reflects the difficulty of predicting how many strokes will be played in the vicinity of a ball so moved. Sometimes, such a ball will be affected by subsequent play before it has been replaced, in which case Law 37.4 specifies that its position is not adjusted. If the striker's turn ends before the ball's position would cease to be relevant to the striker's line of play, the ball is replaced when the turn ends if it has not been affected by play.
 - C37.2.3.1 **EXAMPLE** Y is on the east *yard-line* adjacent to hoop 4. Bab, playing K, has obtained a rush on Y to hoop 1 by a short take-off into the *yard-line area* from R,

which remains nearby. B, 10 yards infield and *dead*, is close to the line of the intended rush. Because the ground slopes up immediately outside the *boundary*, Bab needs to move K infield by two mallet head lengths to have a normal stance. All balls need to be moved by the same amount in the same direction to maintain their relative positions: as well as Y, both R and B could plausibly be affected by the *stroke*. When Bab plays the rush, K rebounds from Y and moves R but Y is rushed past B without hitting it. B must be replaced in its original position, as it is no longer immediately relevant to Bab's play. The position of R is not adjusted because R was moved by the stroke.

C37.2.3.2 **EXAMPLE** Y is in corner II and K, for the peg, is on the north *yard-line* where hoop 2 prevents K from shooting at the peg. Roy's shot of Y at K is obstructed by a fence just outside the *boundary* and Y needs to be moved a mallet head's length towards K to eliminate the interference. K must be moved by the same amount in the same direction, as it is not in a *critical position* with respect to Roy's shot, though it is critical with respect to shooting at the peg. If Y misses K, K will be replaced in its critical position where it has no shot at the peg.

C37.2.3.3 **EXAMPLE** K is on the north *yard-line* near corner II, R is close to hoop 2 but fully visible to K, having just failed the hoop, and Y is just northeast of hoop 2. Bab intends to play K and attempt to *roquet* R (or possibly Y) but a hedge adjacent to the *boundary* interferes with her swing. She needs to move K a mallet head's length south to avoid the interference. Neither R nor Y should be moved, because they are in *critical positions* due to the possibility of K hitting hoop 2 and hitting a ball on the rebound. The length of the shot is reduced slightly, marginally to Bab's advantage, but Laws 37.2 and 37.4 do not prohibit this.

C37.3 SPECIAL DAMAGE

C37.3.1 As defined in the Laws glossary, *special damage* is damage to the surface of the court other than a court's 'normal hazards'. The 7th Edition takes a different approach from earlier Editions by making repairing special damage the preferred option. Only if this is not practicable should a ball affected by the damage be moved, and then only sufficiently to avoid the damage and never to the *striker's* advantage. Before acting by either repairing the damage or moving a ball, the striker must consult in accordance with Law 55.3 by either calling a referee to adjudicate or consulting the opponent.

C37.3.2 The *special damage* law, Law 37.3, needs to be applied not only if the *striker's ball* is in an area of damage but also if another ball relevant to the *stroke* (e.g. a ball the *striker* intends to rush) is in such an area or if there is damage along the line the *striker's* ball will follow that might affect it, particularly by causing it to jump.

C37.3.3 There will be occasions when a referee must decide whether damage to the court's surface qualifies as *special damage* or is of a type that is sufficiently widespread on the court that it must instead be considered a normal hazard (from which there is no relief). Careless removal of a lot of broadleaf weeds without repair to the surface, for example, may have effects that need to be classed as normal hazards.

C37.3.4 If a ball has to be moved to avoid *special damage*, any other ball that could foreseeably be affected by the *stroke* must also be moved in accordance with Law 37.4. As described in section C37.2.3 above and the example in paragraph C37.2.3.1, a ball that is moved and not affected by subsequent play should be replaced as soon as it ceases to be relevant to the *striker's line of play*, or at the end of the *striker's* turn, whichever occurs first.

C38 MISCELLANEOUS INTERFERENCE

C38.1 Law 38 covers four unrelated examples of *interference* with the smooth running of a game.

C38.2 TURN WRONGLY ENDING

- C38.2.1 If the *striker* quits the court in the erroneous belief that the turn has ended (for example, having forgotten the entitlement to play a *continuation stroke* following a *croquet stroke*, or not having realised that an attempted long *roquet* was successful) the opponent is obliged to draw attention to the mistake under Law 23.2.4. That obligation is reiterated in Law 38.1. If the opponent also does not realise the mistake, however, and moves onto the court and plays a *stroke*, the former striker's turn has properly ended under Law 7.5.2.1. If the former striker realises the mistake after that, it is too late to do anything about it.
- C38.2.2 If a player quits the court erroneously believing the turn has ended but then realises the mistake before the opponent has played a *stroke*, however, Law 38.1 states that the player's turn is resumed.
- C38.2.3 Contrast this situation with the example in paragraph C7.3.2.1. In that example, the second player played prematurely before the first player had quitted the court. The second player was playing when not entitled. As a consequence, if the first player realised the mistake at any time before the start of the first player's next turn, the second player had committed an *error*, the second player's turn is annulled and the first player is entitled to resume the turn that was wrongly ended. A player quitting the court in the erroneous belief that the turn has ended has a much shorter period (only until the opponent's first *stroke*) in which to appreciate the mistake and do something about it.

C38.3 **STROKE AFFECTED BY INCORRECT HOOP WIDTH OR MIS-SHAPEN BALL** In the 6th Edition, two different laws covered this situation and those running tournaments were obliged to decide which should apply for the event. The one that was the less stringent was almost universally used and a modified form of that has been made the only applicable law.

C38.3.1 If the *striker* suspects that the *stroke* just played was materially affected by a ball contacting both uprights of a hoop simultaneously, the striker can have the ball and hoop checked. If the ball touches both uprights of the hoop at the same time on some axis, the width of the hoop needs adjustment. If the ball is not spherical within the tolerance, the ball should be replaced.

C38.3.2 If the equipment is incorrect and is adjusted, the player may choose to *replay* the *stroke* provided the opponent agrees, or a referee decides, that two conditions are both satisfied:

C38.3.2.1 the player had attempted to get the ball through the hoop; and

C38.3.2.2 the player's suspicion that the outcome of the *stroke* was materially affected by the incorrect equipment is plausible;

and in addition the player's turn has not ended under Law 7.6 for a reason not related to the incorrect equipment.

C38.3.3 The *striker* attempting to get a ball through the hoop does not only mean attempting to score the *hoop point* (whether for the *striker's ball* or as a *peel*): note that the law uses the expression "get the ball through the hoop" not "run the hoop". The striker may have attempted to get the striker's ball through the hoop to *roquet* a ball on the other side, to play the striker's ball into position to run the hoop in a subsequent *stroke* or turn, or to position another ball through the hoop similarly, or to play the striker's ball or send another ball to a specific position, whether to achieve wiring or for any other reason.

C38.3.4 If the hoop was not one that the *striker* was attempting to get the ball through in the *stroke* just played, the striker is not entitled to a *replay* even if the passage of the ball through the hoop was affected by incorrect equipment. Furthermore, for the striker to be granted a *replay*, the outcome of the *stroke* must have been materially affected.

C38.3.4.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy, playing R misses a short *roquet* on B and R then stops in the middle of a hoop some yards (metres) up the court that is R's *hoop in order*. Roy asks for the hoop and ball to be checked. Roy is not entitled to a *replay* even if it is found that R would contact both uprights of the hoop simultaneously on some axis, as Roy cannot

plausibly claim to have been trying to get R through the hoop in the *stroke* just played, even though it is R's hoop in order. The equipment is adjusted as necessary and R remains where it came to rest in the hoop.

- C38.3.4.2 **EXAMPLE** After running hoop 2, the *striker* sent a pioneer to hoop 4 which happened to stick in the hoop, with the *striker's ball* ending up cross-wired from the ball at hoop 3. It would be unjust to allow the *striker* a *replay* if hoop 4 were found to be set incorrectly and to have affected the passage of the ball through it. There should be no *replay* even if hoop 4 happened to be the ball's *hoop in order*, as the *striker* cannot plausibly claim to have been trying to get the ball through hoop 4.
- C38.3.5 Referees need to be careful when deciding whether the player's claim that the outcome of the *stroke* was materially affected by incorrect equipment was plausible, or instead that the turn has ended for a reason unconnected with the incorrect equipment. If the *striker* attempts a difficult hoop but fails it (and possibly commits a fault by having the *striker's ball* rebound onto the mallet) and the equipment is found to be incorrect, why did the failure and/or fault occur? If it is clear the failure was not due to mis-set equipment (e.g. because the ball rebounded off the near wire or bounced across the hoop off either or both wires without significantly entering the *jaws*) no *replay* should be granted. If the situation is not so clear-cut, the referee may decide to grant a *replay* after correcting the equipment, on the basis that the *striker* will then face a hoop *stroke* of essentially the same difficulty as in the first attempt, and this time will not have faulty equipment as an excuse for failure.
- C38.3.6 Contrast this with a situation where the turn ends for a reason clearly unconnected with the mis-set equipment. For example, the *striker* attempts a *peel* in a big *croquet stroke*, the *peelee* just struggling through the hoop and the *striker's ball* going off the court. The hoop is found to need adjustment and it is corrected, but there is no *replay*, due to the ball off the court ending the turn. The *peelee* remains where it came to rest.
- C38.3.7 If the *striker* is entitled to a *replay* under Law 38.2, the *replay* is optional, not compulsory. The *striker* may have attempted a *peel* from long range, only to find that the *peelee* sticks in the hoop and a check shows that the *peelee* contacts both hoop uprights simultaneously. After the equipment is adjusted, the *striker* may decide that it is more advantageous not to *replay* the *stroke* but instead to leave the *peelee* where it came to rest in the hoop.
- C38.3.8 While the *striker* must attempt again to get the ball through the hoop in a *replay*, the *striker* is not obliged to attempt the same type of *stroke* in the *replay* as was played the first time. The *striker* could, for example, attempt a jump *stroke* to score a *hoop point* in a *replay* after having tried to run the hoop on the ground the first time. The *striker* may not, however, do something other than attempt to get the ball through the hoop in the *replay*. If that happens, Law 38.2.4 allows the opponent to choose either to accept the *replay's* outcome or to require the *striker* to play the *stroke* again, attempting to get the ball through the hoop. This is the same ruling as for *replays* under Laws 34 (*interference* with a ball during a *stroke*) and 35 (*interference* with the playing of a *stroke*) – see paragraphs C34.4 and C35.3 above.
- C38.3.9 If equipment has to be checked and, if necessary, adjusted or replaced, the time taken to do this is restored (see Law 38.2.1). This removes the objection to the requirement to attempt to get the ball through the hoop again in a *replay* on the grounds that the tactical situation has changed because time has expired, or is about to expire.

C38.3.10 **REFEREEING CONSIDERATIONS**

- C38.3.10.1 A player who suspects that the outcome of a *stroke* may have been adversely affected by faulty equipment will often appeal to a referee and say something like "please check the hoop". Referees should realise that in such circumstances, the player is not asking for the width of the hoop to be tested to see whether it is within specifications, but rather to check whether the ball contacts both hoop uprights simultaneously on some axis. Checking the former when the player wants the latter is liable to cause irritation.

C38.3.10.2 There will be occasions when the *striker*, having only just run a hoop and facing a *hampered roquet* with the *striker's ball* in a *critical position*, asks for the hoop to be checked. A referee appealed to should mark the current positions of the ball or balls that the *striker* attempted to get through the hoop, as well as the positions all balls affected by the *stroke* were in before the stroke was played. For the latter, the referee may need to rely on the evidence of the *striker* and anyone else, including the opponent, who can usefully provide it.

C38.3.10.3 When any necessary adjustments have been made and the *striker* chooses a *replay*, the referee can remove any markers indicating where balls came to rest after the *stroke*. Those positions are no longer relevant. The referee may or may not need to adjudicate the replay but, in any event, the markers indicating the positions of the balls before the stroke should be left in place. Should the *striker* not attempt to get the ball through the hoop again in the replay, the opponent will be entitled to require the *striker* to replay the original stroke again, attempting to get the ball through the hoop. The markers will then be required for replacing the balls once more.

C38.3.10.4 If the hoop is too narrow, but the *striker* is not entitled to a *replay* or chooses not to take it, Laws 5.2.3.1 and 24.3.5 can be interpreted to allow the *striker* to continue the turn without waiting for the hoop to be reset if its width is not relevant to the *striker's* intended *line of play*. The opponent can have it reset at the start of the next turn, or when the hoop is about to become relevant to the opponent's play.

C38.4 BALL STRIKING A CLIP OR THE PEG EXTENSION The 7th Edition treats a ball hitting any clip attached to a hoop or the peg extension in the same way: it is not *interference* and there is no remedy. In the 6th Edition, by contrast, this applied only to clips that were part of the game. Any clip that is not attached to a hoop or the peg extension, however, is an *outside agency* and if it interferes with a ball during a *stroke*, Law 34 applies. The same applies to interference by the peg extension should it not be attached to the peg.

C38.5 DISPLACED BOUNDARY MARKING The procedure governing a displaced *boundary cord* requires the cord to be straightened as soon as its displacement is noticed unless doing so would affect either a test of whether a ball has left the court or the playing of the next *stroke*. In those circumstances, it should be straightened as soon as the test or affected stroke has been completed.

PART 3: OTHER FORMS OF PLAY

SECTION A: ADVANCED SINGLES PLAY

C39 OPTIONAL LIFT OR CONTACT

C39.1 LIFT HOOPS The 7th Edition introduces the term "*lift hoop*", meaning those hoops that when scored for the *striker's ball* by the player of one turn entitle the player of the next turn to start that turn by taking a lift or a contact as the case may be. This is just a change in terminology and does not represent any change to the game.

C39.2 HOW TO PLAY THE LIFT When the *striker* is entitled to an advanced play lift, the *striker* can play as the balls lie, or can lift either ball of the side that can lawfully be played and choose one of the options spelled out in Law 39.3.2 for playing the lifted ball. Those options are:

C39.2.1 playing the lifted ball from any unoccupied point on either *baulk-line*; or

C39.2.2 *taking croquet* from a ball that the lifted ball touches when placed on a *baulk-line*; or

C39.2.3 when the *striker* can create a *group of balls* by placing the lifted ball on a *baulk-line*, *taking croquet* from a ball in the group that the *striker's ball* can touch while placed on the *baulk-line*.

C39.2.3.1 **EXAMPLE** B is on the first *corner spot* and K in contact with it on the *baulk-line*. Roy is entitled to an advanced play lift and he lifts R. He can create a *3-ball group* of R, B and K by placing R on the *baulk-line* in contact with K. He may therefore play a

cannon as the first *stroke*, but only with K (not B) as the ball from which he *takes croquet*.

C39.3 If the *striker* is entitled to, and does, *take croquet* as specified in paragraphs C39.2.2 or C39.2.3 above, there is no requirement under either Law 18.1 or Law 39.3 for the *striker's ball* to be on the *baulk-line* when the *croquet stroke* or *cannon* is played. The striker must be able to create the opportunity to play the croquet stroke or cannon by placing the striker's ball on the baulk-line, but when the stroke is played the striker's ball may be in any lawful position under Laws 18.3 (croquet stroke) or 18.4 (cannon).

C39.4 **WHEN ENTITLED TO A CONTACT AND HOW TO PLAY IT**

C39.4.1 When a player scores both of the *lift hoops* for the *striker's ball* during a turn and the player's *partner ball* had not scored the first of the lift hoops before the start of that turn, the player of the next turn is entitled to start that turn by:

C39.4.1.1 playing as the balls lie; or

C39.4.1.2 lifting either ball of the side that can lawfully be played and playing it as described in paragraphs C39.2.1 to C39.2.3 above; or

C39.4.1.3 lifting either ball of the side that can lawfully be played and *taking croquet* from any of the other *balls in play*.

C39.4.2 When the *striker* is entitled to an advanced play contact, the striker should remember the other options available: playing as the balls lie or taking a lift. If there is a ball on or near the *baulk-line*, a lift, with the ability to arrange a rush, will sometimes be more useful than the contact, with its requirement to *take croquet* immediately.

C39.5 **ENDING OF ENTITLEMENT TO LIFTS AND CONTACT** A player who pegs out a ball belonging to either side is not entitled thereafter to any advanced play lifts or contact (but is still entitled to wiring lifts!).

C39.6 **THIRD AND FOURTH TURNS OF THE GAME**

C39.6.1 The clause "that can lawfully be played" in Laws 39.3.2 and 39.5.2 refers to situations where the player of the third or fourth turn of the game is entitled to a lift or contact when required to play the remaining ball of the side into the game. The player must play the ball into the game in the normal way if entitled only to a lift, or may take a contact with that ball if entitled to a contact. The player may not, however, take a lift or contact with the ball of the side already in play. Playing the ball already in play constitutes a *wrong ball error* under Law 27.

C39.6.2 If the player of the third or fourth turn is entitled to a contact under Law 39.5.2, the player's right under Law 11.2.2.2 to *take croquet* immediately from any of the *balls in play*, overrides the general requirement in Law 11.2 to play the ball into the game from a *baulk-line*.

C39.7 **CHANGE OF DECISION** Law 39.8 provides explicit guidance on the circumstances under which the *striker*, having chosen a *line of play* by lifting a ball, is entitled to change that choice. The right to change a decision rests principally on the fact that when the striker lifts a ball of the side that is in contact with another ball, that action does not determine whether the striker is taking a lift or is preparing to *take croquet*. Under the circumstances described in section C39.7.2 below, lifting a ball does not even commit the striker to using that ball as the *striker's ball* for the turn.

C39.7.1 **LIFTING A BALL THAT IS NOT IN CONTACT WITH ANOTHER BALL**

C39.7.1.1 When the *striker* is entitled to a lift or a contact, lifting a ball of the striker's side that is not in contact with another ball chooses that ball as the *striker's ball* for the turn under Law 12.2.2 and the striker must also take the lift or contact. Under whichever of Laws 39.3.2 (lift) and 39.5.2 (contact) is applicable, the striker may not then play the ball lifted from where it initially lay unless that position was on a *baulk-line*.

C39.7.1.2 Should the *striker* replace a ball after having lifted it under these circumstances and play the *partner ball* (either from where it lies or after lifting it) the striker is playing

the *wrong ball* and Law 27 applies. Should the striker replace a ball that was not initially on a *baulk-line* after having lifted it and play it from where it lay, the striker is playing when a ball is *misplaced* and Law 28.7 (failing to play a ball from baulk) applies.

- C39.7.1.3 If the *striker* is entitled to a lift or a contact and mistakenly lifts a ball of the opponent's side but realises the mistake before playing a *stroke*, the striker may replace the ball (in consultation with the opponent!) and try again to make a valid choice of lifting a ball of the side or playing one of them from where it lies.

C39.7.2 **TWO BALLS OF THE SIDE IN CONTACT OR PART OF A GROUP**

- C39.7.2.1 If the *striker* is entitled to a lift or a contact when the two balls of the striker's side are in contact, lifting either of them does not determine the striker's *line of play*. The striker remains entitled to take the lift or contact using the ball lifted, or *take croquet* immediately from the *partner ball*, or choose any of those options using the other ball of the side (Laws 39.8.2.1 and 39.8.2.2). It is not until the striker plays a *stroke* that the *striker's ball* for the turn and the striker's *line of play* (lift or contact or taking croquet) are determined.

- C39.7.2.2 Likewise, if the *striker* is entitled to a lift or a contact when both balls of the striker's side are part of a *group* and lifts one of them, the striker may take the lift or contact using the ball lifted or may play a *cannon*, *taking croquet* from any of the other balls in the group, or may choose any of those options using the other ball of the side (Law 39.8.2.3). It is not until the striker plays a *stroke* that the *striker's ball* for the turn and the striker's *line of play* (lift or contact or cannon) are determined.

C39.7.3 **BALL IN CONTACT WITH AN OPPONENT'S BALL**

- C39.7.3.1 If the *striker* is entitled to a lift or a contact and lifts a ball of the side that is in contact with an opponent's ball, or comprises a *3-ball group* with both balls of the opponent's side, that action selects the ball lifted as the *striker's ball* for the turn under Law 12.2.2. The striker remains entitled, however, to take the lift or contact using the ball lifted or to *take croquet* using that ball from the opponent's ball with which it started in contact, or to play a *cannon* taking croquet from either of the other two balls in the group as the case may be. Which option is chosen is not determined until the striker plays a *stroke*.

- C39.7.3.2 If the *striker* is entitled to a lift or a contact and lifts a ball of the striker's side that is in contact with an opponent's ball, or is part of a *group* with both of them, but replaces the lifted ball and then plays the *partner ball* (either by lifting it or by playing it from where it lies) the striker is playing the *wrong ball* under Law 12.2 and Law 27 applies. Note, however, that the *error* is *rectified* by replacing the partner ball where it lay and placing the ball initially selected in any lawful position. That includes any position on either *baulk-line* – the ball does not have to remain in contact with the opponent's ball or part of a group with both of them.

- C39.7.4 **CHANGING POSITION OF LIFTED BALL** Having lifted a ball validly when entitled to a lift or contact, the *striker* can change the position from which the ball will be played, on a *baulk-line* (Law 39.3.2) or in contact with another ball (Law 39.5.2) as the case may be, until the first *stroke* is played with it.

SECTION B: SUPER-ADVANCED SINGLES PLAY

The 7th Edition of the Laws has brought the laws relating to super-advanced play, previously included as an appendix, into the body of the Laws. This recognises the increasing use of super-advanced play in some jurisdictions. This does not imply that the ACLC is promoting the wider use of super-advanced play – it is agnostic on that matter.

C40 OPTIONAL LIFT OR CONTACT OR FREE PLACEMENT

C40.1 The *lift hoops* in 26-point super-advanced singles or doubles are hoops 4, 7 and 10 (4, 1-back and 4-back) (Law 40.1). Super-advanced play may not be used in shortened games (Law 40.11).

C40.2 ENTITLEMENT TO A LIFT

C40.2.1 When a player scores any one of the *lift hoops* for the *striker's ball* during a turn, the player of the next turn is entitled to start that turn by playing as the balls lie or taking a lift with either ball of the side that can lawfully be played (Law 40.2). The options for taking the lift are the same as under advanced play (see section C39.2 above).

C40.2.2 The circumstances under which the *striker* can change a decision about a lift after having lifted a ball (Law 40.10) are the same as under advanced play (see section C39.7 above).

C40.3 ENTITLEMENT TO A CONTACT

C40.3.1 When a player scores two consecutive *lift hoops* (i.e. hoops 4 and 7 (1-back), or 7 and 10 (1-back and 4-back)) for the *striker's ball* during a turn and the player's *partner ball* had not scored the first of those hoops before the start of the turn, the player of the next turn is entitled to start that turn by playing as the balls lie or taking a lift or a contact as described in section C39.4 above (Law 40.4).

C40.3.2 The circumstances under which the *striker* can change a decision about a lift or contact after having lifted a ball (Law 40.10) are the same as for advanced play (see section C39.7 above).

C40.4 **ENDING OF ENTITLEMENT TO LIFTS AND CONTACT** A player who pegs out a ball belonging to either side is not entitled thereafter to any super-advanced play lifts or contact (Law 40.8). Note the difference between the ending of these entitlements and the ending of entitlement to a free placement (see paragraph C40.5.3 below).

C40.5 ENTITLEMENT TO A FREE PLACEMENT

C40.5.1 When a player scores all three of the *lift hoops* for the *striker's ball* during a turn and the player's *partner ball* had not scored the first of the lift hoops before the start of the turn, the player of the next turn is entitled to start that turn with a free placement, except as described in paragraph C40.5.3 below.

C40.5.2 When the *striker* is entitled to a free placement, the striker starts the turn by

C40.5.2.1 playing as the balls lie; or

C40.5.2.2 taking a lift or contact with either ball of the side that can lawfully be played; or

C40.5.2.3 lifting either ball of the side that can lawfully be played, placing it anywhere on the court, including a point within the *yard-line area*, and playing it from there.

C40.5.3 Both sides' entitlements to a free placement end as soon as any player pegs out any ball (Law 40.6.3).

C40.5.4 The *striker* can change a decision about a lift, contact or free placement after having lifted a ball under the same circumstances as for a lift or contact under advanced play (see section C39.7 above), except that when the striker is entitled to a free placement and lifts a ball that is not in contact with another ball, the striker may play the ball from its original position.

C41 RESTRICTED OPENING

C41.1 This law aims to affect the balance of the opening of a game at the most advanced levels by limiting what the player of the first turn of the game is permitted to do. If the *striker* does not play the first *stroke* of the first turn so that the *striker's ball* crosses the *boundary* (ending in the *yard-line area* is not enough) or hits a hoop or the peg or passes through a hoop, the opponent is entitled to choose to leave the ball where it lies or to require the striker to place the ball anywhere on either *baulk-line*, at the striker's option. The opponent must make this choice before playing the first stroke of the second turn.

SECTION C: HANDICAP SINGLES PLAY

C42 BISQUES

C42.1 A *bisque* is a new turn which must be played with the *striker's ball* of the immediately preceding turn (Law 42.1), provided that ball was validly chosen (section C42.7 below covers the case where it was not validly chosen). Because it is a new turn, all the balls become *live* when the bisque is taken and if the *striker's ball* is within the *yard-line area* it must be placed on the *yard-line* before starting the turn. A bisque may not be split into two *half-bisques* (Law 42.2.2).

C42.2 No point (*hoop point* or peg point) may be scored for any ball during a *half-bisque* turn (Law 42.1). A half-bisque may be used, however, as the first stage of setting out a break which is then commenced by using a *bisque*. A ball may start to run its hoop during a half-bisque turn, the running to be completed and the hoop scored in a subsequent turn. It is risky to attempt this deliberately, however: if the ball completes the running of the hoop in the *stroke*, the point is not scored and the ball must begin to run the hoop again.

C42.3 WHEN A HALF-BISQUE OR BISQUE MAY BE PLAYED

C42.3.1 The only restrictions on a bisque-receiver's right to play a *half-bisque* or *bisque* are:

C42.3.1.1 in a time-limited game, after time is called (see Laws 42.3.1 and 61.2.1 and paragraph C61.4 below); and

C42.3.1.2 when the previous turn has ended because the *striker's ball* has been pegged out (see Law 42.3.1).

Otherwise, the *striker* can play any or all of the *bisques* received in sequence at any stage of the game.

C42.4 MODIFICATIONS TO END OF TURN LAWS

C42.4.1 The modified definition of end of turn in Law 42.3.4, covering any turn following which the *striker* might take a *half-bisque* or *bisque*, is important. The turn ends only when:

C42.4.1.1 one of the conditions for end of turn specified in Law 7.6 has been met or the *striker* quits the court in the belief that it has; and

C42.4.1.2 the balls are correctly positioned (see paragraph C42.4.3 below); and

C42.4.1.3 the *striker* has communicated a decision whether or not to play a *half-bisque* or *bisque*, or has quit the court without doing so.

Note, however, that the clips do not need to be positioned correctly before a bisque is taken.

C42.4.2 Law 42.4 and section C42.5 below cover situations where the *striker* attempts to take a *half-bisque* or *bisque* without having made the intention to do so clear, or the opponent plays before the *striker* has indicated an intention not to do so. Likewise, Law 42.5 and section C42.6 below cover situations where the *striker* attempts to take a half-bisque or bisque prematurely.

C42.4.3 In handicap play players are sometimes unsure whether the *striker's ball* must be placed on the *yard-line* before playing the first *stroke* of the *bisque* turn. The answer is that the bisque turn is a separate turn and the *striker's ball* must be placed on the *yard-line* before the new turn is started. Law 42.5 and section C42.6 below cover the situation where the *striker* takes a *half-bisque* or bisque when the *striker's ball* has been incorrectly left within the *yard-line area*.

C42.4.4 Law 42.3.3 specifies two instances when *bisque* turns are not counted for the purposes of other laws. In the second, third and fourth turns of the game, balls must be played into the game in accordance with Law 11.2. The counting of turns for this purpose does not include any *half-bisque* or bisque that may be taken following one of the first three turns.

C42.4.5 Secondly, Law 42.3.3 also specifically excludes a *half-bisque* and *bisques* from being counted when determining the *limit of claims* of a *wrong ball error* under Law 27.3.

C42.4.5.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy starts a turn playing R but during the turn switches to playing Y. The *error* is not immediately noticed by either side. At the end of the turn Roy takes a *bisque* and switches back to playing R from the beginning of the bisque turn. Roy's error is *discovered* during the bisque turn. Law 42.3.3 means that the *limit of claims* of the *wrong-ball* error has not passed even though Roy began a turn (the bisque turn) by playing the correct ball.

C42.5 INDICATION OF INTENTION

C42.5.1 Law 42.4 requires the *striker* to give a clear indication – either verbally or by gesture – of an intention to play a *half-bisque* or *bisque* following the end of a turn. If the striker continues to play following the end of a turn without giving any such indication, the striker is playing when not entitled. Law 26 applies and no half-bisque or bisque has been taken. Once this *error* has been *rectified*, the striker may choose whether or not to continue by taking a half-bisque or bisque. The purpose of this law is to protect a junior player from inadvertently taking a bisque by playing more *strokes* in a turn than the Laws permit.

C42.5.2 If the *striker* indicates an intention of continuing by playing a *half-bisque* or *bisque*, the decision can be changed at any time before the first *stroke* of the new turn is played, provided the change is communicated clearly. The striker may change from playing a half-bisque to playing a bisque or vice versa or decide not to continue at all. If a striker who has both a half-bisque and one or more bisques indicates an intention of continuing but does so without specifying which of the half-bisque and a bisque is to be taken, the default is that a bisque has been taken (Law 42.4.2).

C42.5.3 If the *striker* has played all of the *strokes* permitted in a turn and indicates an intention not to continue by playing a *half-bisque* or *bisque*, whether verbally or by quitting the court without comment, the striker may not change that decision (Law 42.4.3). Leaving the court to retrieve a ball or for some other purpose (e.g. changing clothes) does not constitute quitting it, but the striker may be well advised at least to give an indication that the question of continuing is still to be decided.

C42.5.4 The opponent must wait until the *striker* receiving *bisques* has indicated whether one is to be played (Law 42.4.4). If the opponent is impatient and begins a turn before the striker has indicated whether or not a *half-bisque* or *bisque* will be taken, the opponent is playing when not entitled and Law 26 applies. If this *error* by the opponent is *discovered* before the striker quits the court, it is *rectified* and the striker is then entitled to decide whether or not to continue with a half-bisque or bisque.

C42.6 PLAYING A HALF-BISQUE OR BISQUE TOO SOON

C42.6.1 Should the *striker* begin a *half-bisque* or *bisque* turn when a ball (particularly the *striker's ball*) has been left *misplaced* within the *yard-line area* and the opponent fails to *forestall* to correct the misplacement, Law 42.5 means that the half-bisque or bisque is validly taken even though the conditions for ending the previous turn specified in Law 42.3.4 (see paragraph C42.4.1 above) have not been met. The previous turn is deemed to have ended before the first *stroke* of the new turn is played.

C42.6.1.1 **EXAMPLE** Roy, playing R, decides to take a *bisque* to continue a break. On the last *stroke* before doing so, he plays R to a position within the *yard-line area* where it has a rush infield on B and then indicates that he will take the bisque. He plays the rush and as he is preparing to *take croquet* from B, Bab intervenes to point out that R should have been brought onto the *yard-line* before Roy took the bisque. Under Law 42.5, however, Roy validly took the bisque and ended his previous turn. The rush stroke is covered by Law 28.2.5 (miscellaneous cases of playing when a ball is *misplaced*) and Bab has no redress: she should have *forestalled* before Roy played the rush.

C42.6.2 Law 42.5 also covers instances where the *striker* indicates an intention of playing a *half-bisque* or *bisque* and does so while still entitled to continue the previous turn. This may occur, for example, when the striker makes a *roquet* without noticing it and consequently

believes incorrectly that that turn has ended. The opponent is required to *forestall*, but if the opponent fails to do so (because the striker's mistake is not noticed rather than because the opponent improperly keeps silent), the *bisque* is validly taken and the previous turn is deemed to have ended. The *striker's ball* does not become in hand, as it ought to have done following the roquet, because the roquet is not recognised as having occurred. Consequently, the striker's ball is lawfully positioned for the *bisque* turn if the striker takes the *bisque* with the striker's ball in the position where it came to rest following the unrecognised roquet.

C42.7 PLAYING A WRONG BALL If the *striker* plays a *wrong ball* in the first *stroke* of a non-*bisque* turn and the *error* is *discovered* and *rectified*, the requirement of Law 42.1 that a *bisque* turn must be played with the *striker's ball* of the preceding turn would create an anomaly. In such a case, if the *striker* chooses to take a *half-bisque* or *bisque* after the error has been rectified, Law 42.6 permits the *striker* to play it with either ball of the side that could lawfully have been played in the first stroke of the ordinary turn. (The same principle is stated in Laws 47.2 and 50.2 for ordinary handicap doubles play and alternate stroke handicap doubles play respectively.)

C42.7.1 EXAMPLE Bab plays R in the first *stroke* of a non-*bisque* turn. The *error* is *discovered* and *rectified*. If Bab now wishes to take a *bisque*, she may play either B or K because she did not validly select the *striker's ball* for her turn.

C42.8 There are three situations where only one ball can lawfully be played in a *bisque* turn after having played a *wrong ball* at the start of a non-*bisque* turn:

C42.8.1 after the third or fourth turns of the game when the *striker* has wrongly played a ball already in play in one of those turns and has been required to place the correct ball on a *baulk-line*; and

C42.8.2 when the *striker* has already chosen a ball as the *striker's ball* by lifting it under Law 16 (wiring lift) but has then somehow played a different ball; and

C42.8.3 self-evidently, when one ball of the side has already been pegged out.

C42.8.4 EXAMPLES

C42.8.4.1 Bab plays B in turn 1, Roy plays R in turn 2 and Bab then plays B (or R or Y) in turn 3. The *wrong ball error* is *discovered* and *rectified*. Bab must place K on an unoccupied spot on either *baulk-line* (see Law 27.2.2). If she now takes a *bisque*, she must play K because K was the only ball that could lawfully have been played when the error was committed.

C42.8.4.2 Bab lifts B at the start of a turn when entitled to a wiring lift for B under Law 16. She replaces it and plays K instead. The *error* is *discovered* and *rectified* by replacing K and placing B anywhere on a *baulk-line*. If Bab now wishes to play a *bisque*, she must play B, which has been validly chosen as the *striker's ball* and therefore was the only ball that could lawfully have been played when the error was committed.

C42.9 RECTIFICATION OF FAULTS If the *striker* commits a fault and has the option of taking a *bisque*, the *striker* may wish to know whether the opponent will have the fault *rectified* before deciding about the *bisque*. The opponent may wish to know the *striker's* intentions before deciding whether the fault should be rectified. Law 42.8 resolves this stand-off by specifying that the *striker* is entitled (but not obliged) to wait for the opponent to decide about rectification before deciding whether to take a *bisque* (but must clearly wait for the decision before playing it).

C43 PEGGING OUT IN HANDICAP GAMES

C43.1 This law is often overlooked or forgotten, particularly if time has been, or is about to be, called or if the *striker's ball* hits the peg accidentally. It applies only to handicap, not level, games. The *striker* may peg out the *striker's ball* only if its *partner ball* is already a *rover ball*, or becomes a *rover ball* during the *stroke*, or if an opponent's ball has already been pegged out or is pegged out during the *stroke*. The law is designed to prevent a player giving a lot of *bisques* from devaluing them by making

an all-round break to the peg and pegging out the ball, leaving the bisque-receiver only three balls with which to make a break.

C43.2 There are two timing issues to note. First, if Bab *takes croquet* with B from R when both are *rover balls* and plays a *stroke* that causes both R and B to hit the peg, both R and B are pegged out irrespective of the order in which they hit the peg because it is sufficient for another ball (R) to be pegged out during the stroke in which the *striker's ball* (B) is pegged out.

C43.3 Secondly, if Bab *takes croquet* with B (a *rover ball*) from K (for hoop 12 (rover)) and plays a *stroke* that causes first B to hit the peg and then K to be *peeled* through hoop 12, B is pegged out because K became a rover ball during that stroke. The law does not require K to be a rover ball before B is pegged out.

C44 RESTORATION OF BISQUES

C44.1 RESTORATION AFTER AN ERROR

C44.1.1 If a *bisque* is taken and then an *error* is committed and further bisques are taken before the error is eventually *discovered*, only the bisques taken after the error was committed are restored when the error is *rectified* (Law 44.1.1).

C44.1.1.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab fails a hoop with B, takes a *bisque* and then plays K in error and while playing K takes three more bisques before the *wrong ball error* is *discovered*. Only those three bisques are restored: the first one was validly taken.

C44.1.2 If a game has to be restarted because the player of the fourth turn is unable to play a correct ball, Law 44.1.2 makes the obvious point that any *bisque* taken before the *discovery* of the *error* must be restored.

C44.1.3 If one or more points scored for a ball are cancelled because it is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game that they were scored out of order, any *half-bisque* or *bisques* used by the *striker* while playing that ball after the first hoop was run out of order must be restored.

C44.1.3.1 **EXAMPLE** Bab starts a break using B with the help of one *bisque*, but misses out hoop 4 and uses another bisque to "score" hoop 5 (out of order). Bab continues the break to the peg using four more bisques. Bab is playing when not entitled by continuing to play after running hoop 5 and the *limit of claims* for that *error* is the first *stroke* of her opponent's next turn. If Bab's omission of hoop 4 is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game, the blue clip must be returned to hoop 4 because only points scored in order count. The four bisques used while continuing the break after running hoop 5 are restored, but the one used before running hoop 5 out of order is not. Bab loses eight hoops plus one she never scored but regains the bisques she used in scoring all but the first of them.

C44.2 **RESTORATION AFTER INTERFERENCE** If play is cancelled because an *interference* under Laws 31 to 33 is *discovered* and must be *redressed*, Law 44.2 makes the obvious point that any *half-bisque* or *bisques* taken during the cancelled play must be restored.

SECTION D: DOUBLES PLAY

The 7th Edition includes alternate stroke doubles in the body of the Laws rather than in an Appendix. For clarity, the more common form of doubles, where each player of a side plays only one ball of the side throughout the game, is referred to in the Laws as "ordinary doubles". Both ordinary doubles and alternate stroke doubles may be played as level, advanced, super-advanced or handicap doubles and the games are named accordingly throughout Laws 45 to 50.

C45 ORDINARY LEVEL DOUBLES PLAY

C45.1 AN OUTLINE OF THE GAME

- C45.1.1 In ordinary level doubles, each player of the side plays only one ball throughout the game, the allocations decided by the first *stroke* played by the side or declared by either player (Law 45.1). If a side's first stroke of the game is declared for a ball without specifying which player will own the ball, the player who made the declaration owns the ball (Law 45.2).
- C45.1.2 Law 45.1 allows a game of ordinary doubles to start in the absence of one of the players of a side. Should that happen, however, and the absent player arrive later, the law permits those managing an event to decide when that player may first play a turn. That may, for example, be after a certain amount of time or after one or more further turns have been played.

C45.2 **ASSISTANCE TO PARTNER** Law 45.2 permits one player of a side to assist the *partner* in preparing for a *stroke*, and therefore permits coaching during a game. This must not be at the cost of maintaining expedition in play, however, and excessive coaching may be considered a form of time wasting and subject to sanction under Law 63.5 (addressing the issue of time wasting).

C45.3 MODIFICATION OF TERMS

- C45.3.1 Law 45.3 indicates in a general way how the laws of singles play are to be adapted to ordinary doubles by modifying the meaning of certain terms (*partner ball*, *player*, *opponent* and *striker*) used throughout the Laws.
- C45.3.2 Law 45.3.2 defines how the modification of terms applies in relation to faults. It is a fault if the *striker's partner* or the partner's mallet touches a ball during the *striking period*, except when the partner 'moves, picks up or arrests a ball that is not relevant to the *stroke*' or in accordance with Law 5.3.2 (e.g. lifting a ball to prevent it being hit by a double banking ball), Law 17.3.1 (when it is acceptable to stop the *striker's ball* after it has made a *roquet*) or Law 22.3.2 (when it is acceptable to stop a ball that has been pegged out). The intention is not to penalise the striker's side for actions by the partner that have no bearing on the game.

C45.4 **PLAYING A WRONG BALL** The *striker* may not score any point for the *partner's* ball by striking it (which is playing the *wrong ball* under Law 27.1.1.3). Any such point the striker apparently scores is cancelled if the mistake is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game (whether or not the *error* of playing the wrong ball is still within its *limit of claims*). If the striker apparently scored a peg point for the partner's ball by striking it, the point is cancelled and Law 31 (wrongly removing a ball from the game) applies.

- C45.4.1 **EXAMPLE** On the western frontier of the croquet empire, in ordinary level doubles Ron, the player of R, set up a rush to hoop 1 for his *partner* Yvonne, the player of Y. At the start of the side's next turn, Ron went on and played Y, making an all-round break with it and setting a leave for R. The opponents played and missed without anyone realising anything strange had happened. Ron then went onto the court to play R and the earlier incorrect play was *discovered*. The *error* of playing the *wrong ball* (Ron playing Y) had gone past its *limit of claims* and the positions of the balls were therefore not altered. Ron cannot score points for Y by striking it, however, so the Yellow clip was returned to hoop 1. There was no adjustment to the time elapsed in the game.

C46 ORDINARY ADVANCED OR SUPER-ADVANCED DOUBLES PLAY

No comment required.

C47 ORDINARY HANDICAP DOUBLES PLAY

C47.1 The method specified in Law 47.1 of determining the allocation of *bisques* (half of the difference between the aggregate handicaps of the two sides) can result in fractional allocations (a quarter or three-quarters of a *bisque*). A quarter is rounded up to a *half-bisque*, while three-quarters is rounded

up to a whole bisque. As in handicap singles, Law 42.2.2 applies: a bisque may not be split into two half-bisques in handicap doubles play. Any bisques belong to the side and so can be taken by either of its players.

C47.2 PLAYING A WRONG BALL In handicap doubles a similar difficulty arises as in handicap singles with taking a *bisque* after a player of the side has started a non-bisque turn by playing a *wrong ball* (which in ordinary handicap doubles includes playing the *partner's* ball). The requirement in Law 42.1 that the bisque be played with the *striker's ball* of the preceding turn cannot apply and the situation is instead governed by Law 47.2. If the side takes a *half-bisque* or bisque, it may be played by either player who could lawfully have started the preceding non-bisque turn. There are three situations when there is no choice as to who takes the half-bisque or bisque, as described in paragraph C42.7 above.

C47.3 EXAMPLES

C47.3.1 Betty plays B in turn 1, Ron plays R in turn 2 and Ken then plays B (or R or Y) in turn 3. The *error* is *discovered* and *rectified*. K must be placed on an unoccupied spot on either *baulk-line* (see Law 27.2.2). If Betty and Ken now take a *bisque*, Ken must play it because Ken was the only player who could lawfully have played the initial *stroke* of turn 3.

C47.3.2 Betty lifts K at the start of a turn when her side is entitled to a wiring lift for K under Law 16. Betty then plays K from *baulk*. The *error* is *discovered* and *rectified*. If Betty and Ken now take a *bisque*, Ken must play it because K has been validly chosen as the *striker's ball* and he was the only player who could lawfully have played K.

C47.4 PEELS If a player *peels* the *partner's* ball through more than four hoops, the extra hoops are not scored (Law 47.3), though the play is otherwise lawful. The points are cancelled if the mistake is *discovered* at any time before the end of the game. If the clip was advanced, it must be correctly placed and the opponents may be entitled to a *replay* if they have been misled. The peeler's partner, however, would have no redress for being misled into running the wrong hoop by a wrongly placed clip and continuing to play after running the wrong hoop would be playing when not entitled under Law 26.

C48 ALTERNATE STROKE DOUBLES PLAY

C48.1 AN OUTLINE OF THE ALTERNATE STROKE DOUBLES GAME Each side in the game comprises two players and, unlike ordinary doubles, both players must be present from the start. Absence may be penalised by event organisers. The two players play alternate *strokes* throughout each turn of the side and from one turn to the next, with whichever ball the side decides should be the *striker's ball* for that turn, in the same way as in singles.

C48.2 ASSISTANCE TO PARTNER As with ordinary doubles, the *partner* may advise and assist the *striker* in the execution of *strokes* but when a stroke is played, the partner must stand well clear of any position that might guide the striker in playing the stroke. With that proviso, it is usual in alternate stroke doubles for both players of a side to be present on court throughout a side's turn. Any guidance and assistance the partner provides to the striker must not be at the cost of maintaining expedition in play and, as with ordinary doubles, excessive coaching may be considered a form of time wasting and subject to sanction under Law 63.5.

C48.3 FAULTS COMMITTED BY THE STRIKER'S PARTNER Law 29 (faults) is modified to make it a fault if the *striker's partner* touches any ball with a mallet or any part of the *body* during the *striking period*. Law 48.3.2 provides the same exemptions as are described in paragraph C45.3.2 above for the partner moving, stopping or picking up a ball in circumstances that have no bearing on the game.

C48.4 PLAYING OUT OF SEQUENCE

C48.4.1 Playing out of sequence is an *error*, but is treated more leniently than playing the *wrong ball* (Law 48.4). Any player in the game who notices that a player is about to play out of sequence must *forestall* play immediately in accordance with Law 23.1. If a player plays out of sequence, despite the vigilance of the other three players, and the error is *discovered* before its *limit of claims*, which is when the third *stroke in error* is played, it is *rectified*.

C48.4.2 The *strokes in error* must then be analysed to see whether any of the turn-ending events listed in Law 7.6 have occurred. For that purpose those strokes in error are treated as

though the correct players played them. If no such event has occurred, the player who should have played the *stroke* that became the first stroke in error resumes the turn without penalty.

C48.4.3 If the *error* is *discovered* after its *limit of claims*, it is not *rectified* and the sequence of play established by the *strokes in error* becomes the new valid sequence.

C48.5 RECTIFICATION OF ERRORS

C48.5.1 If *rectification* of an *error* other than the out-of-sequence error covered by Law 48.4 requires a *stroke* to be *replayed*, the same player replays the stroke (i.e. the sequence of play is preserved). In practice, this applies only to the non-fatal instances of playing when a ball is *misplaced* covered by Laws 28.5 to 28.8.

C48.5.2 When *rectification* of an *error* results in the turn ending, the player who starts the side's next turn is the *partner* of the player who played the first *stroke in error* (i.e. the sequence of play is again preserved).

C48.6 INTERFERENCES

C48.6.1 If an *interference* under Laws 31 to 33 is remedied by cancelling play from the point where play was first affected by the interference, the player who played the first *stroke* that has been cancelled plays the side's next stroke (i.e. the sequence of play is preserved).

C48.6.2 Similarly, if a *stroke* has to be *replayed* due to an *interference* under Law 34 (*outside agency* or player interfering with a ball) or Law 35 (outside agency or opponent interfering with the playing of a stroke) or Law 38.2 (stroke affected by faulty equipment) the player who played the affected stroke must play the replayed stroke.

C48.7 RE-ESTABLISHING A SEQUENCE WHEN IT CANNOT BE DETERMINED WHICH PLAYER SHOULD PLAY

C48.7.1 If an *error* or *interference* that has a long *limit of claims* has to be *rectified* or remedied (e.g. playing a *wrong ball*, or playing when a pegged out ball has not been removed from the game or playing when misled), it may be difficult to work out which player is required to play the side's next *stroke* to maintain the alternate stroke sequence. If this cannot be established, Law 48.7 specifies that the player who plays the next stroke is the *partner* of the player who played the side's last stroke before the error or interference was *discovered*.

C48.7.2 If the players of a side about to begin a turn cannot remember who played the last *stroke* of their previous turn and it cannot otherwise be established (e.g. by consulting the opposition or spectators) which of them should play, the opposing side is required to decide which player must play. The law is designed to encourage players to remember their sequences!

C49 ALTERNATE STROKE ADVANCED OR SUPER-ADVANCED DOUBLES PLAY

No comment required.

C50 ALTERNATE STROKE HANDICAP DOUBLES PLAY

C50.1 In alternate stroke handicap doubles, Law 48, governing alternate stroke doubles play, applies together with Laws 42 to 44, the laws governing handicap singles, with modifications set out in the remainder of Law 50.

C50.2 The number of *bisques* to be given in alternate stroke handicap doubles is determined in the same manner as in ordinary handicap doubles (see paragraph C47.1 above). In taking a *bisque*, the side must preserve the sequence of alternating stroke play from the preceding turn.

C50.3 **PLAYING A WRONG BALL** If a player plays a ball belonging to the opposing side in the first *stroke* of a non-*bisque* turn, Law 27 applies regardless of whether the player has played in sequence or out of sequence. If the *error* is *discovered* and *rectified*, Law 50.2 specifies that only the *partner* may then play a *half-bisque* or *bisque* if one is available. In that event the partner may play either ball of the side that could lawfully have been played in the first stroke of the turn.

C50.4 **PEELS** Since both players will be involved in scoring *hoop points* for both balls of the side, there is no restriction on the number of hoops that players in alternate stroke handicap doubles may score by *peeling* (see Law 50.3).

SECTION E: SHORTENED GAMES

C51 SHORTENED GAMES

C51.1 No comment is required on the 22-point and 14-point variants.

C51.2 18-POINT GAME

C51.2.1 The 7th Edition sees the deletion of the variant of the 18 point game in which the two centre hoops are removed, on the basis that it does not appear to be used anywhere. Of those that remain, the most common is where the game is started with all the clips on hoop 5. The second variant, in which the peg point is the next point in order after hoop 8 (2-back) may be favoured because it preserves the normal hoop sequence starting at hoop 1, thereby reducing the risk of confusion about the hoop sequence, while significantly shortening the game.

C51.2.2 The third variant, known as the hoops 1 and 9 variation, is described in Law 51.2.3 and may be used in singles or alternate stroke doubles, but not ordinary doubles. As soon as a ball of a side scores hoop 1 for itself as the *striker's ball*, or is *peeled* through hoop 1 by the opponent, hoop 9 (3-back) becomes the *hoop in order* for its *partner ball* and the corresponding clip is moved to that hoop. In the case of an Irish peel or half-jump of both balls of a side through hoop 1, the law is generous to the *striker*. Hoop 1 is scored by the *striker's ball* irrespective of the order in which the balls travel through the hoop. Note, however, that a ball cannot score hoop 1 by being peeled through it by its partner ball. This prevents confusion if the *striker's ball* then fails to score hoop 1 itself in the same *stroke* or subsequently.

C52 ADVANCED PLAY IN SHORTENED GAMES

C52.1 **22-POINT GAME** The *lift hoops* are the same as in the 26-point game: hoops 7 and 10 (1-back and 4-back) and the advanced play law (Law 39) applies unchanged.

C52.2 **18-POINT GAME** There is no contact option in any 18-point advanced play game. Law 39 applies with the omission of the parts covering the contact (Laws 39.4 and 39.5) and for the first and third variants (Laws 51.2.1 and 51.2.3) the *lift hoops* are the same as in the 26-point game: hoops 7 and 10 (1-back and 4-back). For the second variant (Law 51.2.2), the lift hoops are hoops 4 and 6.

C52.3 **14-POINT GAME** There are two variants of the 14-point advanced play game. In the first, known as the lift version, there is no contact option and Law 39 applies with the omission of Laws 39.4 and 39.5 and with hoop 4 as the only *lift hoop*. In the second, known as the lift or contact version, Law 39 applies in full with hoops 3 and 4 as the lift hoops.

C53 HANDICAP PLAY IN SHORTENED GAMES

No comment required.

PART 4: CONDUCT OF THE GAME

SECTION A: GENERAL LAWS OF CONDUCT

C54 THE STATE OF THE GAME

C54.1 Either player may ask the opponent factual questions about the *state of the game* and the opponent is required to answer as fully as possible. The list of matters defining the term 'state of the game' in the Laws glossary is deliberately detailed but not exhaustive. There may be other examples of questions about the state of the game.

C54.2 If the opponent gives honest but erroneous information that misleads the *striker*, the striker may be entitled to a *replay* under Law 32. If the opponent gives deliberately misleading information, this is cheating and subject to penalty under the overriding law (Law 63), up to and including disqualification.

C54.3 The *state of the game* does not include information or advice about how to play a *stroke*. Neither does it include information or advice on the Laws or tournament regulations, although the opponent is under a duty to provide information on the Laws and regulations as one of the duties incurred by being jointly responsible for the conduct of the game under Law 55.

C55 RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCT OF THE GAME

C55.1 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PLAYERS

C55.1.1 The 7th Edition makes the players jointly responsible for the conduct of the game in the absence of a referee in charge, but no longer uses the term 'referee of the game' as in previous Editions. By being jointly responsible for the conduct of the game, the players incur duties, as defined in Law 55.2, as well as having rights, including the right to be consulted (see section C55.3 below).

C55.1.2 A player who is not watching the game while the opponent is the *striker* ceases to have duties associated with the conduct of the game. The player's right to be consulted in certain situations then devolves to an obligation on the *striker* to call a referee (see Law 55.1.2).

C55.2 DUTIES OF A PLAYER

C55.2.1 Law 55.2.1 imposes an unqualified duty on the *striker* to announce any *error* or *interference* the *striker* 'believes or suspects may have been committed'. Note the word 'suspects'. Should the *striker* be at all unsure about the legitimacy of a *stroke* or whether preceding play has been in accordance with the Laws, the *striker* must cease play and consult the opponent or call a referee. The matter must be resolved before play resumes. The *striker* retains these obligations even when a referee is active for any reason or someone other than a referee is watching a *stroke*, as specified in Laws 55.2.1 and 55.4.1.

C55.2.2 Law 55.2.2 similarly imposes a duty on the opponent to *forestall* play in relation to any *error* or *interference*, actual or suspected, which comes to the opponent's attention. The exercise of this duty by the opponent is expressly subject to the various parts of Law 23 (when the opponent is required to forestall, when the opponent is required not to forestall and the timing of forestalling). Note that Law 55.2.2 obliges the opponent to forestall even in circumstances that may be against the opponent's own interests.

C55.2.3 Law 55.2.3 brings together in a non-exhaustive list examples of other duties of the *striker* and/or the opponent that are specified elsewhere in the Laws. These include:

C55.2.3.1 the obligation on both sides to draw attention to a misplaced clip (Law 55.2.3.1 and paragraph C23.2.1.5 above);

C55.2.3.2 the opponent's obligation to inform the *striker* that the *striker's* turn has not ended if the *striker* leaves or is about to leave the court in the erroneous belief that it has ended (Law 38.1 and section C38.2 above);

C55.2.3.3 in handicap play the opponent's obligation to inform the *striker* that the *striker* must play one or more *strokes* to complete the current turn if the *striker* proposes to take a *half-bisque* or *bisque* prematurely (Law 55.2.3.3 and paragraph C42.6.2 above); and

C55.2.3.4 the obligation on both players to inform the opponent about the *state of the game* when asked (Law 55.2.3.4 and paragraph C54.1 above).

C55.3 CONSULTING A REFEREE OR THE OPPONENT

C55.3.1 There are various places throughout the Laws where previous Editions required the *striker* to consult the opponent before carrying out some action (e.g. temporary removal of a ball

to avoid interference, testing whether a ball is off the court or has run its hoop or is in a position to do so, playing a *questionable stroke* etc.). This often is not how the striker proceeds in practice: the striker may call a referee without bothering to consult the opponent first.

C55.3.2 The 7th Edition recognises this as acceptable practice. In all laws where the *striker* was previously obliged to consult the opponent, that obligation has been replaced by a requirement to act in accordance with Law 55.3. That means either consulting the opponent, and if appropriate inviting the opponent to act jointly with the striker, or calling a referee to become involved (see Laws 5.3.2, 13.2, 15.8, 16.5.1, 20.5, 37.2 and 37.3). As described in paragraph C55.1.2 above, if the opponent is not available to be consulted then the striker must call a referee.

C55.3.3 The 7th Edition adds a further obligation on the *striker* (see Law 55.3.2): if the opponent is consulted and requests adjudication, the striker must ask a referee to assist. If no referee is available, someone else, including the opponent if necessary, must be asked to act in the referee's place. The striker may not ignore any request from the opponent for adjudication.

C55.4 QUESTIONABLE STROKES

C55.4.1 A *questionable stroke* is one for which either the *striker* or the opponent (not just the striker) suspects that the fairness or the effect may be doubtful (see the definition in the Laws glossary). The striker must either consult the opponent about the need for adjudication or call a referee to adjudicate before playing a questionable stroke (Law 55.4). These are the same options as are available to the striker in other circumstances under Law 55.3 – see section C55.3 above. If a referee is not available but the opponent asks for the *stroke* to be watched, the striker must arrange for an independent person to watch it or, failing all else, get the opponent to do so.

C55.4.2 The law requires the *striker* to inform whoever is adjudicating what the striker intends to do. That does not oblige the striker to say how the *stroke* will be played – for example whether a hoop stroke will be played hard or gently. A wise striker, however, will provide as much information as possible so that the referee or other adjudicator is better prepared for what will happen, increasing the likelihood of the judgement being reliable.

C55.4.3 A *questionable stroke* includes one where its effect may be in doubt, which may cover both dynamic and static questions. The dynamics of a questionable stroke include such matters as whether the *striker's ball roquets* a target ball in or very near a hoop when the target ball could move if the striker's ball hit only the hoop upright. Static positions prior to the *stroke* that may be relevant include, for example, whether a ball is in a position to run a hoop or whether hoop and roquet in the same stroke can occur.

C55.4.4 A case where this law should be invoked more often is when the *striker* is aiming at balls close together on the *yard-line* – the target should be watched carefully to see which ball is hit. Another is where the striker is aiming to rush a ball off the court close to another on the yard-line – the position where the rushed ball crosses the *boundary* should be watched carefully to see whether a *cannon* will result. In the case of peg-outs it is to some extent a matter of local custom as to whether relatively short peg-outs are watched. It may sometimes be more appropriate for a rush of a *rover ball* to the peg to be watched, in case it just grazes the peg, rather than a subsequent short peg-out.

C55.4.5 The *striker* has a duty to take the initiative and consult the opponent or call a referee before playing a *questionable stroke*. Should the striker not do so, the opponent is entitled to *forestall* play to ask for adjudication (Law 55.4.2) and the striker is then playing when not entitled if the opponent's request is ignored or not heard (Law 26 applies).

C55.4.6 The 7th Edition introduces a change in adjudication practice in circumstances where both the *striker* and the opponent fail to call a referee to adjudicate a *stroke* before it is played. The opponent is entitled under Law 55.4.3 to seek to have a fault declared by a referee after the

stroke has been played. A referee who is appealed to may award a fault post-facto if the referee is satisfied that it was committed on the basis of:

- C55.4.6.1 facts about the *stroke* on which the *striker* and the opponent are agreed (e.g. where balls involved in the stroke were before it was played and the type of stroke played); or
- C55.4.6.2 evidence about the *stroke* provided by the *striker*; or
- C55.4.6.3 any observation of the *stroke* that the referee made as it was played and observations of its effects and outcome after it has been played (e.g. the positions of the balls and any sign of court damage); or
- C55.4.6.4 evidence provided by neutral witnesses (specifically excluding the opponent) whom the referee has reason to believe have sufficient understanding of the relevant laws and chooses to consult.

C55.4.7 A referee should be cautious in exercising this power. It is not sufficient for the referee to suspect that there may have been a fault; the referee's judgement must meet the stronger standard of being satisfied that a fault was committed (Law 55.4.3).

C55.5 PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY OF THE STRIKER Law 55.5 prohibits the opponent from following the *striker* around the court and the striker is entitled to take most decisions without reference to the opponent. The striker must consult the opponent, however, if a close decision has to be taken and the opponent is at least as well placed as the striker to offer an opinion. If the opponent is concerned about the legality of some of the striker's *strokes*, typically *croquet strokes*, the opponent is entitled to ask for the appointment of a referee in charge, who can then monitor the legality of both players' strokes.

C55.6 WHEN THE PLAYERS' OPINIONS DIFFER

- C55.6.1 The 7th Edition specifies similar principles as earlier Editions for determining whose opinion is to be preferred when the players' opinions differ about a situation that has occurred, but it places greater emphasis on the importance of players being well placed to make a judgement. This can be expected to make few differences in practice, as it generally follows what players now consider reasonable practice.
- C55.6.2 A common situation is when a player is careless, or there is *interference* by an *outside agency* that the *striker* should have moved but did not, and as a consequence a ball has to be placed or replaced. In such circumstances, the opinion of the non-offender, the player who did not cause the problem, should normally prevail whenever the non-offender is well placed to make a judgement and also when neither side is well placed to do so. Only if the offending side is well placed to make a judgement but the non-offender is not should the offending side's opinion be considered preferable (Law 55.6.1).
- C55.6.3 If the question is whether a ball was hit or has moved, the opinion that there was contact or movement should generally prevail provided the player holding that opinion is well placed to make a judgement. This does not apply, however, in circumstances where a player is making unreasonable claims, such as claiming *roquets* that no-one else sees. In all other situations, the opinion of the player who is better placed to make a judgement is generally to be preferred, provided that opinion is reasonable.
- C55.6.4 Law 55.6.3, encouraging the players to agree to consult reliable witnesses to help resolve differences, is based on common-sense principles of fairness. Independent witnesses may not be consulted by one player without the express permission of the other. Should a player refuse to allow a witness to be consulted, however, the correct procedure is for the other player to call a referee, as a referee has the power to consult witnesses as necessary, overriding any objections from a player.

C56 EXPEDITION IN PLAY

C56.1 Expedition in play is one of the thornier issues that can surround time-limited games. Croquet is not an aerobic activity and there is no requirement that players should sprint between *strokes* (although some do!). A walk that is not obviously dawdling is quite sufficient.

C56.2 Once the *striker* has reached the place from which the next *stroke* will be played, however, it should be played 'with reasonable despatch'. It is here that complaints arise when a player takes a seemingly interminable time to get ready to swing the mallet in earnest. Repeated false starts and re-stalking or interminable casting can raise the blood pressure of even the most patient of opponents.

C56.3 A nine-hoop break with a leave consists of 70 *strokes* at most and can generally be completed in 12 to 25 minutes, giving an average time per stroke of between 10 and 20 seconds. In practice, a referee is unlikely to take action until the average duration rises to at least 30 seconds per stroke (45 minutes for an all-round break) and should also be influenced by the tactical difficulties and court conditions the *striker* faces. It may be argued that players differ greatly in their natural rhythms and that croquet is a game intended to be played with care. Nonetheless, if a time-limit is in operation, the opponent is entitled to consideration. It is noteworthy that some extraordinary accelerations in the pace of play have been seen in apparently slow players when a slender lead has become a deficit.

C56.4 Actions a referee should take in response to a complaint about time wasting have always been contentious, with the referee until now having only the general provisions of the overriding law for guidance. The 7th Edition adds a section to the overriding law (Law 63.5) specifying how a referee should investigate a complaint and options for the referee to use if the complaint is justified and a warning produces inadequate improvement. See section C63.6 below for details.

C57 ADVICE AND AIDS

C57.1 This law deals with the issues raised when a third party interferes with a game by announcing that an *error* or other mistake has been committed or is about to be committed or by providing other types of advice, or when a player seeks advice in any form. The settled policy is that croquet is a private contest between the players and that a game should not be influenced by the eyes, ears or intelligence of other people.

C57.2 Law 57 has been substantially expanded in the 7th Edition, with new or substantially modified sections covering the following topics:

- C57.2.1 a player must not seek advice and may be penalised for doing so (Laws 57.2 and 57.3);
- C57.2.2 encouragement of spectators not to provide advice (Law 57.4);
- C57.2.3 in a team competition team members or officials should not provide advice to a player and if they do so, how the player must handle the receipt of that advice (Law 57.4);
- C57.2.4 what the *striker* should do upon receiving unsolicited advice that the striker is about to commit an *error* or make some other mistake (Law 57.6);
- C57.2.5 what a player (the *striker* or the opponent) should do on receiving other unsolicited advice – e.g. advice that amounts to coaching (Law 57.7); and
- C57.2.6 the use of headphones or earplugs by the *striker* (Law 57.9).

Where appropriate, the overriding law (Law 63) has also been expanded to provide options for a referee responding to breaches of these laws.

C57.3 There are exceptions to the general strictures on a player seeking or receiving advice. The *partner* in a doubles game is always entitled to provide advice (Law 57.1). A 'duly authorised referee', a term used in Law 57.5 to mean one who is officiating in some proper role (not an onlooker who just happens to be a referee), may provide advice related to the referee's duties or concerning an adjudication the referee has made or is about to make. There is a further exception, specified in Law 57.1, if the opponent volunteers advice in breach of Law 58.1. Although a player is not entitled to ask for such advice, it would be unfair to prohibit the player from doing something that may have been the player's intended *line of play* anyway. The reason for prohibiting one player from giving advice to the

other is simple. Such behaviour, even if well-intentioned, can be resented as patronising and overbearing. It can also be a form of gamesmanship which is simply psychological cheating.

C57.4 Law 57 sets out the prohibitions on a player seeking advice or acting on received advice. The penalties that may be imposed for breaching Law 57, however, are set out in the overriding law, Law 63. This separation of offences and penalties gives players an avenue to appeal any decision taken in respect of a breach of Law 57. Refereeing regulations allow a player to appeal any decision taken under the overriding law to the referee of the tournament, whose decision is final.

C57.5 PLAYERS MUST NOT SEEK ADVICE

- C57.5.1 Law 57.2 prohibits a player from referring during a game to information in any form that could assist the player either in the playing of *strokes* or in deciding what *line of play* to follow. The player is entitled, however, to seek clarification of how the Laws, tournament regulations or event conditions apply to a situation that has arisen or may be about to arise.
- C57.5.2 Given the increasing availability of online commentaries or live video feeds, Law 57.2 also prohibits a player from accessing any such commentary or live feed during the game.
- C57.5.3 A player may not seek advice during a game from anyone who is not a participant, except that the player may ask an active referee (i.e. one who has been asked to adjudicate a *stroke* or resolve a situation) about the Laws or *state of the game* and may consult a timekeeper about the amount of time remaining. In addition, the two sides in a game may agree to consult a referee or other observer about a situation when they are uncertain about what has occurred or how the Laws apply to that situation.
- C57.5.4 Finally, a player must not seek or accept coaching from anyone, other than the *partner* in doubles, during a game. Custom dictates that, except in a tournament or match, this restriction can be set aside by agreement between the players to allow coaching to take place.

C57.6 PENALTIES FOR A PLAYER SEEKING ADVICE

- C57.6.1 If a player acts in breach of any aspect of Law 57.2 and the opponent complains, a referee can impose an appropriate penalty. Law 57.3 directs the referee to the recommended penalties in Law 63.6 (see section C63.7 below) but also gives the referee the authority to impose any alternative penalty the referee considers appropriate.

C57.7 SPECTATORS SHOULD NOT PROVIDE ADVICE

- C57.7.1 When a game is part of a team competition, it is important that fellow team members and team officials should not say anything to a player about any aspect of the game and should not comment on the play in any way likely to be overheard by a player (either the *striker* or the opponent sitting on the sidelines) (Law 57.4.1). It is acceptable, of course, for someone to ask whether a player would like a drink of water or other improvement in comfort! Should a team member or team official act in breach of this law, the player receiving the advice may not act on that advice (Law 57.4.2). This is the same restriction as applies in Golf Croquet.
- C57.7.2 Law 57.4.1 also states that other spectators should not similarly provide advice or make comments likely to be overheard. It must be accepted, of course, that the Laws cannot regulate the behaviour of someone who is neither a participant in the game nor a team member or official. Nevertheless, a spectator infringing this law may be politely asked to move away from the players. Law 57.4.3 makes it plain that the restrictions specified in Law 57.4.1 apply also to fellow competitors in an event. They should have less excuse for contravening Law 57.4 than other casual spectators.

C57.8 UNSOLICITED ADVICE THAT AN ERROR OR INTERFERENCE HAS BEEN COMMITTED

- C57.8.1 Law 57.5.1 specifies how a player must act upon receiving advice from someone not entitled to provide it that the player or the player's opponent has already made an *error* or committed an *interference* in four different situations.

- C57.8.2 First, a player is advised of an alleged *error* the player committed during a turn after the player has quitted the court believing that the turn has validly ended (Law 57.5.1.1). The law forbids the player from declaring the error. The rationale for this is that if the opponent has already begun the next turn, any error will have gone past its *limit of claims*. If the opponent has not begun the next turn, however, the opponent may *discover* the error before playing a *stroke* (which would mean that certain errors could still be *rectified*). The law means that in all circumstances the unsolicited advice has no bearing on the balance of the game. The person providing the advice could be politely rebuked for interfering.
- C57.8.3 Secondly, the *striker* is still on the court when informed by a spectator of an *error* allegedly committed during the current turn (Law 57.5.1.2). This recognises that the unsolicited advice places the striker in an impossible position if it is correct and if the *limit of claims* has not passed. The only logical way of continuing the game is to cease play, *rectify* the error and then ask a referee to restore the balance of the game (see section C57.9 below).
- C57.8.4 Thirdly, the *striker* is still on the court when a spectator interferes by informing the opponent that the striker has allegedly committed an *error* (Law 57.5.1.3). This recognises that the spectator's advice places the opponent in an impossible position if it is correct and the *limit of claims* has not passed. How does the opponent deal with subsequent *strokes in error* and what does the opponent do if the striker commits a different error in consequence of the first error? The only logical way of continuing the game is to *forestall* play, *rectify* the error and then ask a referee to restore the balance of the game (see section C57.9 below).
- C57.8.1 While Law 57.5.1.2 unconditionally requires the *striker* to declare an alleged *error* (fatal or non-fatal) that someone has improperly informed the striker about, Law 57.5.1.3 requires the opponent, similarly informed, to act in accordance with Law 23.3. When the alleged error is fatal, or when it is non-fatal and no turn-ending mistake is imminent, the opponent must *forestall* in respect of the alleged error. If the opponent has been improperly informed that a non-fatal error has occurred, however, and is also aware that the striker may be about to make one of the fatal mistakes listed in Law 23.3, the opponent is required not to forestall immediately. The informant should be politely rebuked and the opponent may act as if the person had not spoken.
- C57.8.2 Fourthly, a spectator tells either player that an *interference* under Laws 31 to 33 has occurred (Law 57.5.1.4). The spectator tells one of the players that:
- C57.8.2.1 a ball has been improperly removed or not removed from the game – Law 31; or
 - C57.8.2.2 a ball or clip is *misplaced* in a way that has misled the *striker* – Law 32; or
 - C57.8.2.3 an *outside agency* ball has been brought into the game – Law 33.

In each case, the only logical way of proceeding is to cease play or *forestall*, correct the interference and ask a referee to restore the balance of the game (see section C57.9 below).

C57.9 THE BALANCE OF THE GAME

- C57.9.1 In all of the situations covered by Laws 57.5.1.1 to 57.5.1.4, the alleged *error* or *interference* must be investigated and, if correct and the *limit of claims* has not passed, it must be dealt with. Law 57.5.2 then requires the overriding law (Law 63) to be applied as necessary to restore the balance of the game.
- C57.9.1.1 The balance of the game will usually not be disturbed if the *error* is one of the non-fatal ones covered by Laws 28.5 to 28.8. Following *rectification*, the *striker* is either then entitled to continue the turn, or something happened following the error to end the striker's turn under Law 7.6 and that would likely have been evident to the players.
 - C57.9.1.2 If the unsolicited advice related to a fault committed by the *striker* that neither side had noticed, and a referee concludes that it would have been unlikely to be noticed, the referee could decide that ending the turn would be inappropriate. The referee could use the overriding law to give a different decision (see paragraph C63.5.2 below).

C57.9.1.3 For fatal *errors* covered by Laws 26, 27 and 28.4 that have a longer *limit of claims*, it will be difficult to be sure that the error would not have been noticed by one of the players. It is then difficult to decide what effect the spectator's intervention may have had on the play. A referee may need the wisdom of Solomon in deciding how the overriding law should be applied to restore the balance of the game.

C57.9.1.4 It may similarly be difficult to decide what the effect would be of the unsolicited disclosure of an *interference* under Laws 31 or 32 and a referee may face a similarly difficult task in deciding what action to take to restore the balance of the game. The involvement of an *outside agency* in the game (Law 33) may be more likely to be noticed by the players and remedying it may accordingly be more straightforward.

C57.9.2 The 7th Edition provides specific guidance (in Law 63.4) on options a referee should consider in deciding how to restore the balance of the game (see paragraphs C63.5.1 to C63.5.3 below). This is the first time the Laws have included such options (non-prescriptive, admittedly) rather than leaving action solely to the discretion of a referee.

C57.10 UNSOLICITED ADVICE THAT A MISTAKE IS ABOUT TO BE COMMITTED The 6th Edition stated that the *striker* should not take advantage of unsolicited advice unless it came from the opponent. No other guidance was provided, however, on how the striker should act upon receiving advice about an imminent *error* or other mistake. The 7th Edition provides guidance on how the striker should proceed and action open to either player in a game who considers that the balance of the game has been disrupted by the advice.

C57.10.1 If the *striker* is advised about an imminent mistake that would not of itself have the effect of ending the striker's turn, the striker may act on that advice (Law 57.6.1). This occurs if the advice is that the striker is about to play when not entitled (i.e. the turn has ended anyway), or is about to commit one of the non-fatal *errors* covered by Laws 28.5 to 28.8, or is about to involve an *outside agency* in play (an *interference* covered by Law 33).

C57.10.2 By contrast, if the *striker* is advised about an imminent mistake that would end the turn, Law 57.6.2 requires the striker to inform the opponent. The striker may act on the advice but if it is correct must complete the turn without scoring any further points.

C57.10.3 In either of these situations, either side is entitled to ask a referee to restore the balance of the game, using the overriding law, if that side considers its interests have been adversely affected by the advice and the remedies provided by Laws 57.6.1 and 57.6.2. See paragraphs C63.5.4 to C63.5.6 below for the options available to the referee.

C57.11 OTHER UNSOLICITED ADVICE If either player in a game receives other advice, i.e. advice not related to a past or imminent mistake but relevant to the game or the player's play, Law 57.7 requires the player to inform the opponent about the advice. An example might be advice such as "you haven't used Blue yet" when it looks as though the *striker* is about to end the turn. Again, a referee may be asked to restore the balance of the game using the overriding law by either player who considers the player's interests may have been harmed by the advice. See paragraph C63.5.7 below for the options available to the referee.

C57.12 THE USE OF HEADPHONES This is a new law in the 7th Edition dealing with problems that arise when a player may consider that the opponent is receiving advice through headphones or when the wearing of headphones is creating communications difficulties. Only a referee is permitted to act to require headphones to be removed, to avoid perceptions of gamesmanship if a player were permitted to deal with the opponent directly.

C57.13 MARKS AND MARKERS The *striker* may not make or place a mark to help judge the strength or direction of a *stroke*, but may make use of any pre-existing mark (e.g. an irregularity on the turf or a daisy), or a mallet (provided the mallet is removed before the stroke is played). This includes use of the mallet as a set-square to align the striker's ball for a take-off. The exception stated in Law 57.10.3 to the general prohibition allows markers to be used to mark the position of a ball that may need to be replaced. Plastic golf markers are generally preferred; coins should not be used because of the risk of serious damage to mower blades if they are left on the court.

C57.14 **TRIAL BALLS** Similarly, the *striker* must not use a ball to help decide how to play a *stroke* or whether the intended stroke is playable, or to test the clearance of the ball in a hoop. Again, there is an exception if the ball is being used by a player carrying out an adjudication as a referee. The phrase “other than as part of the lawful positioning of a ball for a stroke” means that a *ball in hand* can be placed in any of its possible positions to decide the optimal one, but not, for instance, placed against a hoop upright to test whether a wiring lift might be about to be conceded or whether another ball also resting against the upright can be rushed in a desired direction.

C58 MISCELLANEOUS LAWS OF CONDUCT

C58.1 The reason for the prohibition in Law 58.1 on the opponent providing advice to the *striker* has been covered in paragraph C57.3 above.

SECTION B: SPECIAL LAWS

C59 DOUBLE-BANKED GAMES

C59.1 This law sets out procedures to be followed for the smooth running of *double-banked games* on the same court. The 7th Edition has changed Law 59.2, specifying how to decide which game should take precedence when both require the same area of a court. The new order is aimed at minimising disruption to either game and giving precedence to a game that is getting close to its time-limit.

C59.2 The 7th Edition also recognises (in Law 59.3.2) what has become increasingly common practice of carefully marking and removing a ball in a *critical position* when it is holding up a *double-banked game* and is not imminently to be moved as part of the play in its game. The players in the game to which the ball belongs who are available to be consulted must give permission for removing the ball.

C59.3 A player who wishes to mark a double-banked ball and intends to consult only the *striker* in that game should be careful. The position of the ball may not appear to be *critical*, but in fact it may be for wiring purposes and the *striker* in the other game may be unaware of the fact.

C60 TOURNAMENT AND MATCH PLAY

C60.1 Law 60.1 makes all of the Laws subject to provisions of the tournament regulations applicable to an event. This is a change from the 6th Edition, which excluded the overriding law from being subject to tournament regulations. The ACLC could see no good reason for this exclusion.

C60.2 **IMPASSES** The procedure for dealing with an impasse, previously included as an official ruling in the 6th Edition, has been included unchanged as an appendix to the 7th Edition Laws.

C60.3 **TESTING** Both players have the right to observe a referee conduct any test, although they must not get in the way nor appear to be pressuring the referee. Either player is entitled to appeal if the player believes that the Laws are being incorrectly applied by using an invalid procedure, but not just because the player holds a different opinion about the outcome of a test validly undertaken.

C61 TIME-LIMITED GAMES

C61.1 The 7th Edition has added to the Laws the long-standing provisions of various tournament regulations concerning time-limits. The well-known provisions of the time-limit regulation are retained, with the addition of a law concerning how the *discovery* of an *error* or *interference* affects the decision about when the change-over of turns occurs and provisions specifying when a game’s time may be suspended.

C61.2 In time-limited games, Law 61.1.2 specifies that, for the sole purpose of determining who is in play when time expires, a turn ends and the next turn simultaneously begins when the *striker* plays the last *stroke* of the turn or declares it to have been played when entitled to make such a declaration. This gives a more precise definition than Law 7.5 (which may depend on when a ball comes to rest) and avoids an undignified scramble to replace balls and place clips.

C61.3 This specification of how the change-over of turns occurs must be modified in the rare instances when it is *discovered* after the *striker* has played the last *stroke* of a turn that an *error* or *interference* has occurred and its *limit of claims* has not passed. If an error under Laws 26 to 29 is discovered, the

turn does not end until the error has been dealt with (which usually but not always means until it has been *rectified*) (Law 61.1.3). The same applies to the discovery of the error of playing out of sequence under Law 48.4 in alternate stroke doubles (Law 61.1.4). If an interference is discovered and remedying it requires a stroke to be *replayed*, the time remaining in the game must be reset to what it was when the original stroke was played (Law 61.1.5).

C61.4 HANDICAP PLAY Because a *half-bisque* or *bisque* may not be played at the end of either of the two turns that comprise the extension period (Law 61.2.1), it is necessary to specify when a half-bisque or bisque is played for the purposes of the time-limit law. Regardless of when a player indicates an intention to take a half-bisque or bisque, the half-bisque or bisque is played only when the first *stroke* of that extra turn is played (Law 61.2.2). A player who fails to play the first stroke of the extra turn before time expires loses that opportunity to take the half-bisque or bisque. That also means that the opponent's next turn began before time was called.

C61.5 WHEN TIME MAY BE SUSPENDED A game's time may be suspended only when out-of-the-ordinary events occur (Law 61.4). This does not include when a referee is required to carry out normal duties, including a wiring test. Time may be suspended, however, if the referee is required to obtain additional equipment for a test from somewhere else in a venue, or is required to reset or replace equipment or repair court damage. If a player in a game is called away to act as a referee in another game, time may be suspended in that player's game under Law 61.4.3 while the player is absent and it is the player's turn to play. The other reasons why time may be suspended are obvious, but note the requirement that a miscellaneous delay (weather, a hold-up for double banking etc.) must last at least 5 minutes before time may be suspended. Note also that the provisions of Law 61.4 may be varied by a specific ruling in tournament regulations or event conditions.

C62 LOCAL LAWS

No comment required.

C63 OVERRIDING LAW

C63.1 In the 7th Edition, the overriding law has been substantially expanded to include guidance to referees on restoring the balance of the game (Law 63.4), dealing with time wasting (Law 63.5), and penalties for a player seeking advice (Law 63.6). These are included in the overriding law to ensure that players always have a right to appeal against any decision a referee may take under them. That would not be the case if they were included in the laws dealing with the issues themselves.

C63.2 Law 63.1 expressly refers to this document in cases of interpretative difficulty. These should be few in number but no-one can guarantee what the imagination of croquet players and the random accidents of the game may produce. Hence the reference to this document as a source of guidance and, where unavoidably necessary, an authoritative statement of the correct interpretation of a Law.

C63.3 Law 63.2 allows a referee to take action if a player breaches one of the laws in a manner for which no penalty is prescribed. There are various ways in which this might occur and a referee may act by imposing one of the penalties prescribed in Law 63.3 or taking any other action the referee considers justified in the circumstances. The following are examples of such breaches.

C63.3.1 Roy does not *forestall* Bab when she is about to take a lift shot from a point not on the *baulk-line*, but does forestall immediately after the *roquet* is made. To what extent has Roy breached Law 23.2?

C63.3.2 Roy accidentally moves a ball between *strokes* while exploring whether it is possible to play a *hampered* stroke to *roquet* that ball. He attempts but fails the hampered roquet and Bab then stops play and claims Roy was not permitted to play that stroke. Roy has breached Law 36.2.3 but why did Bab not *forestall*? A referee appealed to could decide to take no action, given the outcome of the stroke, or replace the *striker's ball* where it was. Alternatively, the referee could replace the balls and direct the *striker* to play a non-critical stroke or to play the *striker's ball* to a neutral position of a type proposed by the referee.

- C63.3.3 Bab has rushed a ball towards hoop 12 and needs only to score that hoop to be able to peg out to win a tense game. Before taking croquet, she places the *striker's ball* in hoop 12 to test the clearance, thereby acting in breach of Law 57.11 (trial ball).
- C63.3.4 Roy says that he will take a *bisque* when he is still entitled to play one further *stroke* in a non-bisque turn. Bab acknowledges the request but when Roy fails to make good use of the bisque she tells Roy that he could have obtained a much better position by playing the last stroke of the turn before taking the bisque.
- C63.3.5 Bab plays a lengthy roll attempting to get hoop running position and the *striker's ball* stops in good position, but it appears as though the croqueted ball might have gone out had it not collided with a stray ball moving from the next court. Bab runs the hoop and then goes and places the croqueted ball on the *yard-line*. Had Bab attempted to avoid a compulsory *replay*?

C63.4 Law 63.3 sets out a range of measures available to a referee so that justice may be done. That is the overriding requirement. It should not be forgotten. Neither should it be forgotten that disqualification is the last resort. The aim of the lawmakers is to promote the playing of croquet and disqualification is a public humiliation, which may well cause the recipient to leave the game for good. This is not to be desired but, nonetheless, the loss of a cheat is no loss at all.

C63.5 RESTORING THE BALANCE OF THE GAME

- C63.5.1 **ALLEGATION THAT AN ERROR OR INTERFERENCE HAS BEEN COMMITTED** When a referee is required to restore the balance of the game, the guiding principle is to choose a remedy that best meets the justice of the case. Laws 63.4.3 to 63.4.5 specify options the referee should consider, taking into account the likelihood of the *error* or *interference* otherwise being *discovered* and the penalty associated with it. Law 63.4.2 permits the referee to choose a different remedy should that appear preferable in a specific case.
- C63.5.2 At one end of the spectrum of options are those when the referee concludes that the *error* or *interference* would otherwise have been unlikely to have been *discovered* within its *limit of claims*. The referee could permit the *striker* to continue the turn without penalty or restriction, or to continue the turn subject to whatever restrictions (e.g. on the number of points that may be scored) the referee considers reasonable.
- C63.5.3 At the other end of the spectrum of options are those when the referee concludes it is likely that the *error* or *interference* would otherwise have been *discovered* within its *limit of claims*. The referee could require the error to be *rectified* or the interference *redressed*, as the case may be, and then either apply the prescribed penalty immediately or permit the *striker* to play one further *stroke*, for example, putting the *striker's ball* into a neutral position.
- C63.5.4 **ADVICE THAT THE STRIKER IS ABOUT TO COMMIT A MISTAKE** The guiding principle for the referee is again that the remedy must best meet the justice of the case. The referee must take into account the likelihood of the *striker* *discovering* the mistake before committing it and the advantage gained by acting as permitted by Laws 57.6.1 and 57.6.2. Laws 63.4.7 to 63.4.9 specify a range of options the referee may choose, but Law 63.4.6 also permits the referee to choose a different course of action should that appear appropriate.
- C63.5.5 Should the referee consider it likely that the *striker* would have *discovered* the imminent mistake before committing it, the referee could conclude that the unauthorised advice has little impact and accordingly permit the *striker* to act on it and also remove the restriction on the *striker's* play imposed by Law 57.6.2.
- C63.5.6 On the other hand, if the referee concludes that the *striker* would gain a significant advantage from the advice and would otherwise have been unlikely to *discover* the mistake before committing it, the referee could impose even stricter limitations on the *striker's* turn than are prescribed in Laws 57.6.1 and 57.6.2. This could even include directing the *striker* to end the turn by playing the *striker's ball* to a neutral position.

C63.5.7 OTHER ADVICE The key consideration for the referee is the significance of the advantage the *striker* would gain by acting on the advice. If the advantage appears minimal, the player could be permitted to act on the advice without penalty. Should it appear that the striker would gain a significant advantage, however, the referee is required to take whichever of the actions specified in Law 63.3 appears most appropriate to negate that advantage.

C63.6 ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF TIME WASTING

C63.6.1 Whether or not a player is wasting time and is in breach of Law 56 (expedition in play) is a contentious issue that can make a referee's life difficult and raise a player's blood pressure. Laws 63.5.1 to 63.5.3 describe the procedure to be followed when a player considers the opponent is wasting time. The player must first inform the opponent of the player's concern. If that does not result in immediate improvement, the player may ask a referee to adjudicate. The referee should watch the play (it is not necessary to watch the play of both sides) and if the referee concludes that the speed of play is unsatisfactory, the referee should warn the players that specified action will be taken at any point thereafter if the speed of play does not improve.

C63.6.2 Law 63.5.6 describes two options for action by the referee and also permits the referee to take any other action the referee considers suitable in the circumstances.

C63.6.3 The first option specified in Law 63.5.6, adding extra time, should be used only when one player is wasting time towards the end of a game to deny the opponent an opportunity to catch up. It is not intended as an option for dealing with habitually slow play.

C63.6.4 The second option specified in Law 63.5.6, imposing a cumulative time-limit on the turns of both sides, is suitable for dealing with unacceptably slow play at any stage of a game. The cumulative time-limits specified in Law 63.5.6.2 have been criticised as overly generous. Should the manager of an event take that view, the manager has the authority to decide before an event starts that different limits will be used during the event for any game on which a cumulative time-limit is imposed (Law 63.5.9).

C63.6.5 A decision on whether to vary the cumulative time-limits, however, should take into account the nature of the playing conditions. Experience in monitoring play during a major event while the 7th Edition Laws were being finalised suggested that the limits specified in Law 63.5.6.2 are reasonable when playing conditions are challenging.

C63.6.6 If cumulative time-limits are imposed on a game, someone suitably knowledgeable needs to monitor and time the play thereafter. That person does not thereby have the status and powers of a supervising referee (Law 63.5.5).

C63.6.7 Should a cumulative time-limit expire during a turn, Law 63.5.8 directs that the *striker* must then complete the turn by playing a maximum of 8 further *strokes*, these to be completed within 3 minutes. The limit of 8 strokes could allow the striker to score a *hoop point* for the *striker's ball* and then use each of the other three balls once before ending the turn.

C63.7 PENALTIES FOR A PLAYER SEEKING ADVICE

C63.7.1 A player who is found to be in breach of the prohibitions in Law 57.2 on seeking advice is penalised for a first offence by being permitted to play only one further *stroke* in the current turn (if the *striker*, Law 63.6.1.1) or to play only one stroke in the next turn (if the opponent, Law 63.6.2.1).

C63.7.2 A second offence by a player or side while the player, or a player from the side, is either the *striker* or the opponent is punished by the loss of the side's next turn (Laws 63.6.1.2 and 63.6.2.2 respectively). That is the case regardless of whether the second offence was of the same or a different type from the first and regardless of whether the player concerned was the striker, the *striker's partner* or the opponent on the first occasion.

C63.7.3 Should there be a third offence by a player or a player from the side at any time during a match, the player or side immediately loses the match, regardless of the circumstances in which any of the offences occurred (Laws 63.6.1.3 and 63.6.2.3).