

SPECIAL
POINTS OF
INTEREST:

- 'What's your view'
Responses to the 3
questions posed in
issue 4
(pages 2 and 3)
- Adverts & useful
addresses (page 4)

The newsletter can only be successful if it receives copy for
Publication. Please submit articles, letters and questions to
notchers@btopenworld.com
http://www.notchers.co.uk

Notchers' News

ISSUE 5

MAY 2009

The network for scorers

This newsletter is *your* forum for sharing news and experiences, discussing scoring issues and networking.

NOTCHERS' NEWS HAS A HOMEPAGE

Previous issues of the newsletter, the Short Guide to Scoring and other useful information can be found there at

<http://www.notchers.co.uk>

Thanks to Chris Thomas for volunteering to set up and manage the homepage

EGGHEADS v NOTCHERS

A team of County Cricket Scorers challenge the BBC 2 Eggheads

The scheduled date for screening of this match is

MONDAY 15th June 2009 on BBC 2 at 6pm

... and still on the County Cricket Scorer theme

by John M Brown

Mike Smith, the last of the county scorers to have played first-class cricket, but who sadly died three years ago, used to have a fascination with overs in which there had been six different entries (eg. 2 . 1 w 4 ∇). Andrew Hignell, the Glamorgan scorer, decided that these should be named *Smudge overs* in tribute to Mike's memory.

Quite often county scorers will point out, usually after four or five balls, that an over is about to be a *Smudge over*, provided that the final ball is a wicket or a three or whatever. Usually, of course, the final ball requires a repeat of an earlier entry, but I had three valid occurrences during the 2008 season.

This year, however, I actually recorded a **seven-ball Smudge over**: It was Wavell Hinds bowling the fortieth over in the televised Pro40 match in Cardiff on 8th September 2008 and this went **6 3 + 1 2 w .** - quite a rare event. Andrew and I were both hoping that the last ball would be a dot ball, and were delighted when it came to pass.

If anyone needed further proof that many cricket scorers are eccentric with an odd view of the world, then I suppose this tale will provide further evidence that they are right, but I wonder if anyone else can beat it.

Our congratulations to:

Linda Curtis on being appointed to score in the Women's ICC World Twenty20

Polly Rhodes on being appointed as the Somerset Second XI Scorer

The last weekend of April 2009 saw the death of Phil Rogers, aged 61 years.

He was an ACU&S Qualified Scorer Member, scoring Fenners, MCC Outmatches and local club cricket. I'm advised that he had been appointed to score some Yorkshire CCC Second XI matches in 2009.

Despite his job taking him away from his home club in East Yorkshire he remained actively involved in cricket, both where his work took him and in Yorkshire. He also contributed to Notchers' News.

It was typical of Phil to ask that donations be equally divided between Lord's Taverners and Save the Children Fund in Egypt

Answers to the three questions from *Notchers' News* - Issue 4

(Revisit the questions by accessing Issue 4 on Notchers' News homepage at www.notchers.co.uk)

With thanks to Stan Bennett, previously Chairman of the ACU&S Technical Committee and member of the MCC Laws Working Party for reviewing the answers and offering additional comment.

MATCH 1: BATTERS AT THE WRONG ENDS - submitted by a scorer in Asia

From a SCORING viewpoint the correct way of handling this incident is to:

- Continue to record events as they happen on the field of play – dot ball, runs etc to batsman who is actually the striker, even if you know that the batsmen are at the wrong ends.
- Make a note of the over & delivery on which the player were first at the wrong ends

This was an umpiring mistake and **not** a scoring mistake, therefore, even if some retrospective adjustment was possible - and it was clearly not possible in this case - no adjustment could be made. That is because Law 21.9 refers to 'a mistake in scoring', and does not refer to 'a mistake in umpiring', nor to 'a mistake in the score'.

Can the third umpire interrupt the game?

A difficult question, and we don't know if the umpires discussions at the pre-match conference would have provided for the third umpire to interrupt the game if a problem arose.

If a problem is noticed by the third umpire he is usually seen to take a drink to the umpires at a time other than a drinks break to provide an opportunity for discussion (the drink may or may not have been requested!).

At some ICC and ACC matches the umpires, third umpire, match referee and scorers are provided with walkie-talkie radios so that problems can be addressed discreetly and promptly.

When nothing can be done about the problem, as in the case in question, there seems to be little point in trying to inform the umpires until the players have reason to leave the field of play.

From an UMPIRING viewpoint:

In the match described it appears that the umpires had a difficult task. They were doing more than their umpiring duties because the players had a limited knowledge of the Laws of Cricket and many of the players looked similar. The additional pressures may have taken their concentration away from player recognition.

Law 27 gives the umpire the right to change a decision but this applies only to a decision concerning dismissals, which is why it is in the Law that deals with appeals. In the situation in question no mistake is made until the ball next comes into play (when the wrong batsman is facing) so the umpires have until that moment to put things right.

A mistake was made. As soon as the ball next came into play - ie when the bowler started his run up for the next delivery - the opportunity to put things right was lost and the situation must be accepted by everyone concerned or the match cannot continue (though, if the umpire were to call Dead ball before that ball were delivered and then send the batsmen to the right ends, no-one would complain and common-sense would be the winner).

Law 3.13 states that "All disputes shall be determined by the umpires. The umpires shall consult with each other whenever necessary"

In the situation described both the fielding side and the umpires failed to notice that the batsmen were at the wrong ends and there was no "dispute".

To be in the position described, the batsmen must have changed ends at the end of an over. This could be out of ignorance **but** the umpires should consider the possibility that this was some form of gamesmanship. If they believe it to be the latter they should inform the governing body.

There is an interesting variant on this scenario that happened in a Lancashire match some years ago. After an interval the batsmen went to the correct ends, but Brian Statham, having bowled the last over before the break, bowled the first over after it - from the same end. Mistakes do happen.

It is difficult to score matches where the players look alike, have few distinguishing features in their appearance and additionally have limited knowledge of the finer points of the game.

Scorers must find ways of differentiating between the batsmen - a band of colour on footwear or clothing, colour of a bat handle or markings on the bat. Pencil notes against the batsman's name provide helpful reminders but be quick to erase your trigger note if it could offend the 'out' batsman.

The compliment received for noting one of two overweight batsmen as 'slimmer' could have been so different!

MATCH 2 – SUBMITTED BY A SCORER IN THE AMERICAS

Player absenting himself from the field; Absent when his side commenced their innings; returned at the fall of the 9th wicket. Should Side B's objection to him batting have been upheld? Could the league committee change the result?

In such cases the first comment that comes to mind is to quote Nigel Plews. His view was that only the umpires on the day, with all the facts before them, can make the decision.

APPLYING THE MCC LAWS OF CRICKET TO THE QUESTION:

'Player X' was clearly one of the nominated players and therefore entitled to take a full part in the game (Law 1.2). He was allowed to bat, bowl, keep wicket and field even though a substitute has previously acted for him. There are no restrictions in Law regarding when a player can bat in the batting order when he has been off the field while his side was fielding, though this could be varied by league or competition regulations.

The reasons for sending 'Player X' off the field of play did not preclude him from taking a further part in the game.

The initial decision made by the umpires not to allow 'Player X' to bat was incorrect.

Their subsequent decision to allow him to bat and to allow play to continue until the overs were completed or a result had been reached was justified.

AN ADDED CONCERN

The question was raised: "Did the umpire(s), by removing the bails when the 9th wicket fell, indicate that match had ended and, if they did, can they change that view and restart proceedings".

The facility for changing their mind is in Law 27 and applies only to dismissals.

Law 21.10 indicates that the result is not finally known until the umpires and scorers agree the scores.

In most cases the call of Time does nothing except stop play taking place, mostly until the next call of Play, and confirm the fact that the ball is dead anyway.

No part of Law can be seen explicitly to prohibit a restart, other than the bit about agreeing the scores.

The considered opinion then was, if they had agreed the scores, they had, by implication, agreed the result and there could be no restart.

Law 3.13 says that all disputes shall be determined by the umpires. They did what the Law requires - they dealt with a difficult situation to their own satisfaction. The final decision was theirs and only those with all the facts before them could make an informed judgement.

IN SUMMARY

- The player who left the field and his captain both acted incorrectly in not informing the umpires of the reason for the player leaving the field of play.
- The captain should have advised the umpires that the substitute was now fielding
- The umpires should have noticed the absence of the player and the presence of a substitute fielder
- The umpires made a mistake in saying that 'player X' could not bat, but then took action to correct it. Well done for admitting an error.
- The league management was correct in saying that they cannot change the result of the match. (Law 21.10)
- Natural justice appears to have prevailed!

PENALTY RUNS - *The hypothetical question arising from discussion at a Level 1 Umpire Training Course*

Option 1 was discounted as the side batting second always wins by wickets.

Option 3 For a side to win by penalty runs the team batting second must be all out and Side B were clearly not all out.

THE ONLY POSSIBLE RESULT IS A WIN BY 10 WICKETS.

The problem, however, is whether the innings needs to start.

If it does, then the teams would go out onto the field of play, all the various formalities would take place and then, as soon as the bowler starts his run up the innings will have started; as a result has now been achieved the umpire will call Time. All a bit silly, really.

The preferred solution is the commonsense approach (Law 43):

Agree the scores with the scorers, inform captains of the result, avoid the second innings farce.

MORE ON 'TWO SCORERS SHALL BE APPOINTED.....'

Sue Drinkwater reports that in leagues in her area:

"it is becoming compulsory to have a scorer and you have to drop a player if you don't provide an independent scorer! This has resulted in more demand for scorer training. We have got one course full of scorers from various clubs and another course for Stroud Cricket Club only, who have got 10 people wanting scorer training all on their own. Apparently they have several junior teams and these are mainly parents who have to score when their children are playing. Both courses will be fairly basic and not lead to any exams."

Robbie Burns comments:

- I prefer being on my own to having a succession of players who do not know how to score and are asking questions which may or may not be relevant to the immediate situation.
- I will not touch the opposition scorebook. A captain was somewhat surprised when I declined to complete his book as well as mine.

Roy Jennings offers the following

- When scoring alone 'always book first scoreboard second'.
- League regulations in respect of each side providing a scorer can prove difficult to enforce. In our the top 2 divisions had the above regulation; for the other divisions they simply said that each team will have a competent scorer. No one could ever tell me what the definition of competent was or who judged on competency. On asking umpires if there was section on their match reports to comment on the scorers the answer was no. On suggesting to the league that they had one standard regulation I received a reply that they could not do this as they felt that a number of clubs would have to fold as some were finding it hard to get 11 players without finding a scorer. I now find it odd that the regulation to have a scorer or play one short will now apply to all leagues in the pyramid. Just as I retire the needed regulation comes in, such is life.

More of your questions, news and views are welcomed for use in future issues

USEFUL EMAIL ADDRESSES

England and Wales Cricket Board Association of Cricket Officials (ECB ACO)
<http://www.ecb.co.uk/ecb/ecb-association-of-cricket-officials/>

International Institute of Cricket Umpires and Scorers
<http://www.umpires.tv> (For scorer specific information email scorers@umpires.tv)



*For books, scoring equipment
and coloured pens;
To access the Bulletin Board;*

**Visit the Acumen Books
website at
www.acumenbooks.co.uk**

MILLENNIUM SCORING RECORD

The A3 scoring record originally designed by members of the ACU&S Scorers' Board. Contact milsteadmsr@btinternet.com for more information

Binder and 50 sheets (= 100 innings) £20 + P&P
Refill pack of 50 sheets £10 + P&P

Scorer Correspondence courses

ECB ACO offer an Introductory level course - For more information visit the ECB ACO web site.

A standard level equivalent course is independently run to the high standards previously set by The Association of Cricket Umpires and Scorers. It is open to anyone wishing to learn more about cricket scoring.

For more information contact cathy.rawson@btopenworld.com

Share your cricket scoring experiences and scoring questions with readers. Photos are welcomed and add interest to the newsletter.

Send your contributions to: notchers@btopenworld.com

July newsletter copy date: 25th June 2009

Total Cricket Scorer

An easy way to score and analyse matches with comprehensive statistics, and even control your electronic scoreboard

To download your free trial copy, or for more information, please visit our website:

www.totalcricket scorer.com
cricket@code27.com

CODE 27

As used at Lord's