

# Notts News

## Newsletter of the Nottinghamshire Chess Association

2005-06 No. 32 22 April 2006

<http://www.nottschess.org/>

[nottsnews@nottschess.org](mailto:nottsnews@nottschess.org)

### Rules Revision Meeting

John Crawley writes with a few comments in reply to the points Ian Kingston made re some of the rules of the Nottinghamshire Chess Association.

- ◆ Do I detect a slight 'dinosaur' mentality over this question of the use of digital clocks? They are much, much easier to use. They are more accurate than other clocks and it is much easier to see the time remaining from them. You don't have to get your nose down on the table to see accurately the time you have left as you do with other types of clocks!

- ◆ Rules A12 and E7 seem to me typical of the modern way of tackling a problem. You avoid at all costs a confrontation with the person/people/team/club which was the first to take 'liberties' and instead you make a blanket, draconian rule which points fingers at everyone! Instead of engendering trust in others' motives, such rules only make for distrust every time an unavoidable situation arises.

Most clubs are extremely honest and reliable and all they want to do is play chess. There will be times when it is not possible to fulfil a fixture (car breakdown/accident, last minute illnesses etc.), and I would hope that these would be looked at with some compassion. If it is found that there was not a valid reason for not turning up for a match, then just award the match and points to the home team. Surely it is not necessary to give an extra 'punishment'. Such penalties should only come if there was a subsequent 'transgression'.

- ◆ If there really is a problem with teams altering their team order, and I must say I have never come across it in this Association, then we simply need to adopt the system used in the Derbyshire League where each team captain has a card of their own and they enter their team before swapping cards to fill it in on the opposing captain's card. With this system there is no way of changing your board order.
- ◆ I can think of several situations where players may want to move to a different club mid-season. Some are unavoidable, such as moving house. A Grantham player moving to Mansfield in October is probably not going to want to travel to Grantham every week. They'll play for Mansfield.

### NCA Blitz Championship: 2 May 2006

Gambit Chess Club, Federation House, Claremont Road, Nottingham

Six-round Swiss, 10 minutes per player per game

Enter on the night (£3.00 per player) up to 7:20 p.m. Play starts 7:30 p.m.

Further details at [http://www.nottschess.org/2005\\_06/blitz.html](http://www.nottschess.org/2005_06/blitz.html)

Out of loyalty a high graded player stays with a club despite their 1st team having been relegated from the First Division, only to find in November that the standard of chess he is getting is not good enough. He looks for a team which will give him what he needs for high-quality chess.

Why should people not change club? Every other sport allows it and the only stipulation made is that they should not be allowed to play in cup competitions where they have already taken part.

I would hope that the LMC would be very understanding of people's personal motives in wanting to change club and they would not be hidebound by the rules and regulations.

- ◆ I too would agree that a *bona fide* member needs to be defined. For instance, suppose five Russian engineers (who just happen to be grandmasters) with a four month contract in Chilwell come to the West Nottingham Club on a regular basis and, not surprisingly, are selected to play for the 1st team up until January, when they go back to Russia. Would they be counted as bona fide members, as they had only selected one club to play for whilst they were here? (Please excuse the wishful thinking!)

- ◆ On the question of board order I must agree with one of the points made by Steve Burke. Strict grading order will probably affect the 'doubling up' which many clubs rely on for the existence of so many teams in the league. A very strict adherence to such a rule would, I am sure, mean many teams being withdrawn from the league.

The 'letter of the law' is that teams should keep as best they can to a grading order. The Fixtures Secretary and the League Secretary should be constantly aware of what order teams are playing their members in and, if there are obvious anomalies, then surely a quiet word would be sufficient.

### Request for exemption from quick play time limits

Drag Sudar

The LMC received the following request for exemption from quick play time limits (rule B8):

'I hereby apply for adj. The reasons are I'm 70 yrs old and quite often play like a prat. Best Wishes Janos Wagenbach'.

The request was written on a ripped off flap from a chess clock box. The LMC members unanimously rejected the request.

Here are comments from various members of the committee:

- ◆ The decision is in line with the discussions at recent LMC meetings
- ◆ The manner in which it was delivered left a lot to be desired
- ◆ The LMC should not consider requests on frivolous grounds
- ◆ His age is not relevant

- ◆ He is perfectly capable of playing very quickly, and quite unlike a prat, in games
- ◆ He plays numerous tournaments that have quick play time limits
- ◆ He has no physical difficulty in handling a clock

## National Club Championship

Paul Todd reports that Ashfield's team (Stan Cranmer, Bob Taylor, Malcolm Jackson and Cliff Potter) has reached the semi-finals of the Minor Championship Plate, beating Alwoodley of Leeds 4-0 despite being outgraded on all four boards.

## League results

Just two matches in the league this week. Radcliffe & Bingham 1's slim hopes of survival in Division 2 were extinguished by defeat in their final match, while in Division 3 Ashfield 3 sealed promotion with a draw against Bunkers 2..

### Division 1

No matches this week.

### Division 2

Radcliffe & Bingham 1 – Grantham 1					
1	Day, T.	(154)	½	– ½	Payne, N. (168)
2	London, N.	(133)	0	– 1	Pierbattisti, G. (141)
3	Toms, D.	(131)	½	– ½	Mason, B. (102)
4	Nicholson, I.	(132)	1	– 0	Smith, P. (78)
5	Murfet, G.	(131)	0	– 1	Cumbers, C. (84)
			<b>2</b>	<b>– 3</b>	

### Division 3

Ashfield 3 – Bunkers 2					
1	Details awaited	½	– ½	Harvey, K. (138)	
2		1	– 0	Carter, M. (124)	
3		0	– 1	Spencer, A. (106)	
4		0	– 1	Moore, M. (88)	
5		1	– 0	Allen, P. (102)	
			<b>2½</b>	<b>– 2½</b>	

### Division 4

No matches this week.

### Division 5

No matches this week.

## League tables

### Division 1

Champions: Gambit 1

Relegated: West Nottingham 1 and one of University 1, Gambit 2 and West Bridgford 1

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Gambit 1	15	12	1	2	49½	25½	24	0	25
2 Mansfield 1	16	9	5	2	44	36	8	0	23
3 Ashfield 1	15	7	3	5	38½	36½	2	0	17
4 Newark 1	15	7	2	6	37½	37½	0	0	16
5 University 2	15	5	4	6	38	37	1	0	14
6 West Bridgford 1	15	4	4	7	36½	38½	-2	0	12
7 University 1	15	4	4	7	32	43	-11	0	12
8 Gambit 2	15	3	5	7	33½	41½	-8	0	11
9 West Nottingham 1	15	3	0	12	30½	44½	-14	-2	4

### Division 2

Champions: Bunkers 1

Promoted: West Nottingham 2

Relegated: Fiveways 1 and Radcliffe & Bingham 1

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Bunkers 1	14	9	3	2	43½	26½	17	0	21
2 West Nottingham 2	14	9	1	4	41	29	12	0	19
3 Nomads 1	14	6	4	4	35½	34½	1	0	16
4 Grantham 1	14	6	3	5	37	33	4	0	15
5 Ashfield 2	14	4	3	7	31	39	-8	0	11
6 Long Eaton 1	13	7	0	6	33½	31½	2	-4	10
7 Radcliffe & Bingham 1	14	3	2	9	31½	38½	-7	0	8
8 Fiveways 1	13	2	2	9	22	43	-21	0	6

### Division 3

Promoted: Ashfield 3 and either Bunkers 2 or Mansfield 2

Relegated: Ashfield 4 and one from Fiveways 2, University 3 and Nomads 2

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Ashfield 3	14	10	1	3	43½	26½	17	0	21
2 Mansfield 2	13	8	3	2	40	25	15	0	19
3 Bunkers 2	13	7	4	2	37½	27½	10	0	18
4 Gambit 3	14	6	3	5	38	32	6	0	15
5 Fiveways 2	13	2	6	5	28	37	-9	0	10
6 Nomads 2	14	3	4	7	28½	41½	-13	0	10
7 University 3	13	3	5	5	30	35	-5	-2	9
8 Ashfield 4	14	1	2	11	24½	45½	-21	0	4

### Division 4

Champions: Newark 2

Promoted: West Nottingham 3

Relegated: Bunkers 3 and Nomads 3

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Newark 2	14	13	1	0	49½	20½	29	0	27
2 West Nottingham 3	13	8	2	3	38½	26½	12	0	18
3 Radcliffe & Bingham 2	14	7	0	7	35½	34½	1	0	14
4 Gambit 4	13	5	3	5	35	30	5	0	13
5 West Nottingham 4	14	6	1	7	33	37	-4	0	13
6 Ashfield 5	14	6	0	8	30	40	-10	0	12
7 Nomads 3	14	5	2	7	34½	35½	-1	-2	10
8 Bunkers 3	14	0	1	13	19	51	-32	0	1

### Division 5

Champions: West Bridgford 2

Promoted: Long Eaton 2

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 West Bridgford 2	16	11	1	4	43½	20½	23	0	23
2 Long Eaton 2	16	11	1	4	41½	22½	19	0	23
3 Long Eaton 3	16	10	1	5	35½	28½	7	0	21
4 Grantham 2	15	9	1	5	35½	24½	11	0	19
5 West Nottingham 5	16	7	2	7	34½	29½	5	0	16
6 University 4	14	7	2	5	27	29	-2	-6	10
7 Bunkers 4	15	3	1	11	20½	39½	-19	0	7
8 Gambit 5	14	4	2	8	23	33	-10	-6	4
9 West Nottingham 6	16	1	1	14	15	49	-34	0	3

## League Management Committee Minutes

*Minutes of the LMC meeting held at Gambit Chess Club on 07/02/2006*

Present: Wallace Bryce (WB), Ian Fillingham (IF), David Levens (DL), Alex Posazhennikov (AP), Barry Redburn, Drag Sudar (DS).

Apologies received from Steve Burke and Maurice Hill.

WB was appointed acting chairman.

*Previous Meeting On 17/10/2005*

The minutes of the previous meeting in July were approved. In the one matter arising the LMC approved DS' proposal (to be seconded by DL) to remove all references to adjudication from the rules.

*Rules A3 & A4e*

The meeting noted that DL would not be able to vote on the two items involving West Nottingham (WN) but agreed to allow him to be present at the discussion of the items.

DS said he had informed WN he would abstain from voting on the item that involved Gambit to ensure that the vote was seen to be conducted in a fair manner.

IF also decided to abstain.

*Rule A13*

Last July DS had informed the LMC he would ignore rule A13 in producing the fixture list mainly due to 5 teams moving home nights to Tuesday and to cater for clubs' requirements, and this would result in some matches between teams from the same club being scheduled in January.

AP had expressed concern that a league rule was to be broken in order to cater for the wishes of clubs.

After discussion, the LMC concluded that DS should have sought permission from the LMC.

DL proposed a change to rule A13 – from 31st December to 31st January – which WB offered to second.

The LMC decided not to penalise the teams that had broken rule A13 due to the fixture list.

AP expressed concern that some rules were allowed to be broken but others were strictly applied. DS said it was impractical to strictly apply all the rules, giving examples including teams agreeing to postpone matches without requesting permission and every single captain breaking D2e.

The LMC decided to seek guidance from the AGM as to how strictly the rules should be applied.

The LMC asked the LS and RS to review the rules with a view to streamlining them.

*Rule C2 – Request for Eamon Lim (EL) to play for WN having already played for Nomads this season*

DL said EL had approached them stating his wish to play for them. He had played once for Nomads.

BR was initially against due to the potential affect on opposition teams in the division Eamon would play in.

DS said that WN had not consulted Nomads and had e-mailed the LMC directly rather than following the correct procedure of sending the request to the LS. Nomads had objected to Eamon playing for WN and were unhappy at WN's conduct.

After discussion the LMC voted 4–1 to allow Eamon to play for WN, as it was his first season. The LMC asks all clubs to remind players they are committed the club for the whole season. The LMC instructs all clubs that requests under C2 must be sent to the LS and that the player's original club should be consulted.

*Rules A12 & E7 – WNI's appeal against a default to Gambit I on 29/11/2005*

DS reported that WN I defaulted after DL failed to get Brian Hayward's (BH) agreement to postpone that night's match. A week after Gambit claimed the match WN asked DS to agree to a postponement. DS told WN that DL had not sought permission (A12a), that an inability to raise a team was not a valid reason to postpone and that WN should have made more effort to find replacements or to turn up with the three available players (WN had informed DS that the 3 the players (two juniors) had no transport). WN appealed.

DL stated that on the morning of the match, with some of his players already unavailable, he was informed that a player was ill. He also felt unwell so tried to contact BH and they finally spoke in the early afternoon. BH did not agree to a postponement. DL informed BH that WN I would not be able to play the fixture.

DL informed the LMC that he felt illness was a compelling reason for asking for a postponement.

BR said that WN I could have made more effort to turn up and if the LMC overturned the default it could set a precedent where teams might postpone matches when short of their better players.

WB said although it was unfortunate that players had become unavailable at short notice more effort should have been made to play the fixture.

DL felt he had not had enough time to try and find other players or sort out transport.

DS said there should have been enough time from early afternoon to try to arrange something.

DL felt the penalties were harsh and said in the previous season he had happily agreed to a postponement when a team was struggling for players, as he believed the emphasis should be to play chess.

The LMC agreed that A12a was perfectly clear that a postponement had to be requested before the fixture.

AP thought that the £10 fine should be revoked as DL had contacted BH before the match.

BR said the penalty should be as stated in E7, 2 points and £10.

WB suggested the two-point penalty be reduced to one point.

The LMC voted 3–0 not to overturn the default.

The LMC voted 2–1 against upholding both the 2-point penalty and the £10 fine.

The LMC voted 2–1 to uphold the 2-point penalty.

The meeting closed at 9:58 pm.