

## Question 19

*The second incident occurred during a Maccabi competition night and arose when a player fouled, which also prompted the referee to call a miss. As soon as this player had fouled he turned his back to the table with his bridge hand still resting on it and put his other hand over his eyes as if to say 'oh! what an idiot I am'. The next sequence of events was that the cue ball, still in motion, struck the players bridge hand. Reacting in complete surprise to the ball touching his hand the player quickly pulled it away, inadvertently knocking the only red left on the table into a pocket. His opponent was then 33 points in arrears even after the awarding of the four points for the foul and required at least 7 penalty points to win. The acting referee when questioned, was adamant that he was sure there was no intention by the offender to divert or stop the cue ball or to remove the last red from the table. It did however, result in the non offender being hugely disadvantaged.*

*How should the referee react to this.*

Answer.

Section 3 Rule 15 (Ball moved by other than the striker) is the relevant rule for this incident and as in poser 18 it is the non striker who is the architect. The rule states that the referee shall reposition the ball to its previous position or the position in his opinion where it would have come to rest and without penalty.

This applies to the both the cue ball and the pocketed red and is one of the very few times that such a red is returned to the table.

The other thing to say here is that if the referee feels that the action of moving or diverting the ball or balls at any time is or was deliberate then a first and final warning at least, should be given to the offender that any further such action will result in the frame being awarded to his opponent, or the match if the severity demands it. It might also be appropriate to inform the players that as soon as they cease to be the striker, as this player was as soon as the foul was called, they should leave the table.

As an aside:-

What the acting referee also failed to do in this case was to calculate the difference in the scores before calling a miss. If the non offender was 33 points in arrears after the awarding of 4 points for the foul and with only one red remaining in play then the difference in the scores before the foul was 37 points and with only 35 points available a miss should not have been called unless the stroke was deemed to be deliberate. In this case, as in most cases, it is not possible to determine that the intention was to deliberately miss and therefore it should not have been called.