

6-6d/6

Omission of Penalty on Returned Score Card Discovered Before Close of Competition

Q. A competitor returned a score lower than actually taken for the 12th hole due to failure to include a penalty incurred when he removed an out of bounds stake that interfered with his stance. If this is discovered before the close of competition, is the competitor disqualified for a breach of Rule 6-6d?

A. The competitor is disqualified if he knew that he had incurred a penalty for removing the out of bounds stake but failed to add the penalty to his score.

If the competitor did not know that removing the stake resulted in a penalty, the Exception to Rule 6-6d applies. The competitor incurred the two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 13-2 and the Committee must also add the additional two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 6-6d to the competitor's score on the 12th hole. (New)

6-6d/7

Omission of Multiple Penalties on Returned Score Card Discovered Before Close of Competition

Q. A competitor returned a score card and failed to include two penalties he did not know he had incurred – e.g. on the 4th hole when he lifted his ball from the putting green without marking its position in breach of Rule 20-1 and, on the 5th hole, when he eliminated an irregularity of surface in breach of Rule 13-2. Is the competitor subject to an additional two-stroke penalty under the Exception to Rule 6-6d for each hole where his score is incorrect?

A. Yes, the competitor incurs a two-stroke penalty under the Exception to Rule 6-6d for each hole at which he committed a breach of Rule 6-6d. In this case, the Committee must add a one-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 20-1 to the competitor's 4th hole score and the additional two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 6-6d to his score on the 4th hole, and a two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 13-2 to the competitor's 5th hole score and the additional two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 6-6d to his score on the 5th hole. (New)

6-6d/8

Omission of Disqualification Penalty on Returned Score Card Discovered Prior to Close of Competition

Q. A competitor returned his score card without including a penalty of disqualification he had incurred (e.g. he had made a stroke with a non-conforming club or did not correct his error of playing a wrong ball). If this is discovered before the close of competition, is the competitor disqualified for a breach of Rule 6-6d?

A. Yes. The Exception to Rule 6-6d does not apply to a failure to include a penalty of disqualification, even if the competitor was unaware he had incurred the disqualification penalty. (New)

6-6d/9

Omission of Penalty Stroke for Breach of Rule with General Penalty

Q. On the 10th hole a competitor accidentally causes his ball to move in breach of Rule 18-2. The competitor is aware that the penalty for a breach of Rule 18-2 is one stroke, but is not aware that he is required to replace the ball and play it from its original location. Does the Exception to Rule 6-6d apply if the competitor fails to include the additional penalty stroke in his score for the 10th hole?

A. Yes, the Exception to Rule 6-6d applies if a competitor fails to include one or more penalty strokes on a hole that, prior to returning his score card, he did not know he had incurred. In this case, the Committee would include the additional penalty stroke under Rule 18 for the competitor's failure to replace the ball, and the additional penalty of two strokes for a breach of Rule 6-6d would also be added to the competitor's score on the 10th hole.

This also applies to situations where a competitor is aware of a breach of the Rules, but, unaware that the penalty for the breach is two strokes, mistakenly returns a score card that includes a one-stroke penalty for the breach. (New)

6-6d/10

Competitor Correctly Advised by Fellow-Competitor That He Incurred Penalty Disagrees and Fails to Include Penalty in His Score

Q. A, in ignorance of the Rules and with the concurrence of B, his marker, improved the area in which he was to drop a ball by repairing a divot hole. Subsequently, C, a fellow-competitor, advised A that he (A) was in breach of Rule 13-2. A disagreed, failed to settle the doubtful point with the Committee at the end of the round and returned his score card without including a two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 13-2.

Before the close of the competition, C advised the Committee of the incident. Should A be disqualified under Rule 6-6d?

A. Yes. Rule 6-6d provides that a competitor must be disqualified if he had returned a score lower than actually taken for any reason other than failure to include a penalty he did not know he had incurred. As C pointed out to A that he had proceeded incorrectly and A took no action to check whether he had incurred a penalty before returning his score card, A is deemed to have known that he had incurred a penalty.

The same result would occur if, for any reason, a competitor were to be uncertain as to whether he had proceeded correctly or incurred a penalty. (New)

Other Decisions related to Rule 6-6d: See “Scores and Score Cards” in the Index.

INDICATING LINE OF PLAY OTHER THAN ON PUTTING GREEN

8-2a/0.5

Meaning of “Anyone Indicating Line of Play” and “Placing of Mark for Purpose of Indicating Line of Play” in Rule 8-2a

Rule 8-2a allows a player to have the line of play indicated to him by anyone. However, any mark placed by the player or with his knowledge, for the purpose of indicating the line of play, must be removed before the stroke is made.

For example, the following actions are not a breach of Rule 8-2a:

- Prior to playing from the teeing ground on a hole where the landing zone is not visible, a player asks his fellow-competitor whether an object (e.g. a building) in the distance is in line with the middle of the fairway, and the fellow-competitor advises that it is.
- In taking relief from a water hazard, a player places a towel at the point where he estimates the ball last crossed the margin of the hazard. The player drops back on a line to the hole under Rule 26-1b and the towel is on his line of play when the player makes his stroke. As the towel was not placed for the “purpose of indicating the line of play” there is no breach of Rule 8-2a.

However, the following is an example of an action that would be a breach of Rule 8-2a:

- Prior to a player making a stroke from five yards off the green, and with the player’s knowledge, his caddie places the player’s bag at a specific position behind the green for the purpose of indicating the point where the player should aim, and leaves the bag in place while the player makes his stroke. (New)

8-2b/0.5

Meaning of “Indicating Line of Putt” and “Placing of Mark for Purpose of Indicating Line of Putt” in Rule 8-2b

Rule 8-2b allows a player to have the line of putt indicated to him by his partner or either of their caddies. However, the putting green must not be touched nor may a mark be placed anywhere for the purpose of indicating the line of putt.

For example, the following actions are not a breach of Rule 8-2b:

- Prior to a player playing from the putting green, his caddie points to but does not touch a repaired ball-mark on the line of putt that the player should use as an aiming point.
- As a player is preparing to play from the putting green, his partner tells him to aim at the edge of a sprinkler head (i.e. a fixed object) that is located behind the green.

However, the following are examples of actions that would be a breach of Rule 8-2b:

- Prior to a player playing from the putting green, his caddie touches the putting green with the flagstick behind and to the right of the hole to indicate the point where the player should aim his putt.
- As a player is lining up his putt, his caddie places a water bottle on the grass behind the green to indicate the point where the player should aim his putt and removes the bottle before the player makes his stroke.
(New)

ANCHORING THE CLUB

14-1b/1

Intentionally Holding Forearm Against Body When Making Stroke

Q. Rule 14-1b prohibits a player from anchoring the club by use of an “anchor point”, which Note 2 to the Rule defines as a player intentionally holding “a forearm in contact with any part of his body to establish a gripping hand as a stable point around which the other hand may swing the club”.

Does this always preclude the player from intentionally holding his forearm against his body when making a stroke?

A. No. A player is permitted to intentionally hold one or both forearms against his body in making a stroke, provided doing so does not create an anchor point – see Decision 14-1b/2. (New)

14-1b/2

Meaning of “Anchor Point” in Note 2 to Rule 14-1b

Q. Rule 14-1b provides that a player must not anchor the club during a stroke by using an “anchor point”. In Note 2 to the Rule, which defines “anchor point”, what does it mean “to hold a forearm in contact with any part of the body to establish a gripping hand as a stable point around which the other hand may swing the club”?

A. The “anchor point” provision prohibits only a very specific type of stroke in which a forearm is intentionally held against the body as an indirect means of anchoring the club. For an anchor point to exist, the following two criteria must be met: (1) the player must intentionally hold a forearm against the body; and (2) he must grip the club so that the hands are separated and work independently from one another (i.e. the top hand effectively secures the club in place as if attached to the body to establish a stable point, while the bottom hand is held down the shaft to swing the lower portion of the club around that point). (New)

14-1b/3

Explanation of “Forearm” in Relation to Rule 14-1b

Note 1 to Rule 14-1b provides that a player may hold his club against his hand or forearm in making a stroke. For the purpose of Rule 14-1b, “forearm” is the part of the arm below the elbow joint and includes the wrist. (New)

14-1b/4

Player Anchors Club Prior to Stroke

Q. A player anchors the club at address or during the backward movement of the club for the stroke, but stops anchoring before he makes the stroke. Is the player in breach of Rule 14-1b?

A. No. The prohibition against anchoring in Rule 14-1b only applies while the player is making the stroke (i.e. the forward movement of the club made with the intention of striking at and moving the ball). (New)

14-1b/5

Portion of Stroke Anchored

Q. A player directly anchors the club or a gripping hand, or anchors a forearm to establish an anchor point, during some portion of the stroke but not all of it. Is the player in breach of Rule 14-1b?

A. Yes. If the player intentionally holds the club or a gripping hand against his body, or establishes an anchor point during any part of the stroke (i.e. the forward movement of the club made with the intention of striking at and moving the ball), he is in breach of the Rule. (New)

14-1b/6

Club or Gripping Hand Inadvertently Touches Body During Stroke

Q. When making a stroke, a player's club or gripping hand inadvertently comes in contact with or brushes against his body. Is he in breach of Rule 14-1b?

A. No. The prohibition in Rule 14-1b applies only to a player who intentionally anchors a club, either directly or through use of an anchor point, in making a stroke. (New)

14-1b/7

Club in Contact with Clothing During Stroke

Q. If a player makes a stroke with the club or a gripping hand in contact with an article of clothing that he is wearing, in what circumstances does that constitute direct anchoring of the club in breach of Rule 14-1b?

A. Clothing held against the body by a club or gripping hand is treated as if it is part of the player's body for the purpose of applying Rule 14-1b. Therefore, if the player were to intentionally use the club or a gripping hand to press an article of clothing against any part of his body, other than the forearm or a gripping hand, he would be in breach of this Rule. However, merely touching an article of clothing with the club or gripping hand in making a stroke is not a breach. This might occur in various situations, such as where the player is wearing loose fitting clothes or raingear, where the player's physical size or build causes his arms naturally to rest close to the body, where the player holds the club extremely close to the body, or where the player for some other reason touches his clothing in making a stroke.

Intentionally using a gripping hand to hold an article of clothing worn on any part of the body while making a stroke is a breach of Rule 14-3 – see Decision 14-3/7. (New)

14-3/19

Player Uses Training Aid Several Times Prior to Stroke

Q. During a stipulated round, a player places a weighted donut on a golf club to warm up while waiting for the fairway to clear. After taking several practice swings with that club in breach of Rule 14-3a, the player adds an additional weighted donut and takes a few more practice swings with the club. Has the player breached Rule 14-3 more than once?

A. No. As related acts resulted in one Rule being breached more than once, the player incurs a single loss of hole penalty in match play or a two-stroke penalty in stroke play – see Principle 3 in Decision 1-4/12. (New)

14-3/20

Player Uses Artificial Devices on Separate Occasions

Q. During play of the 1st hole, a competitor placed an alignment rod at his feet in breach of Rule 14-3a, incurring a penalty of two strokes. During play of the fifth hole, the player again breached Rule 14-3, either by again placing an alignment rod at his feet or in some other manner, such as using a device to measure distance when the Committee had not put the Local Rule into effect. What is the penalty for the second breach?

A. The player is disqualified for breaching Rule 14-3 on more than one occasion during the stipulated round. Whether the player breached Rule 14-3 in the same manner twice prior to two separate strokes or in two different manners prior to two separate strokes is irrelevant. See Decision 1-4/12 for related acts or multiple breaches made prior to a single stroke. (New)

14-3/21

Player Wears Non-Conforming Glove for Multiple Strokes

Q. During play of the 1st hole, a player plays his tee shot while wearing a non-conforming glove and continues to wear the glove until after making his second stroke. He is then informed that wearing such a glove is a breach of Rule 14-3. What is the penalty?

A. Despite the wearing of the glove being continuous, each stroke is an intervening event in defining a breach and therefore the player is disqualified for breaching Rule 14-3 more than once during a stipulated round (see Decision 1-4/14). If the player had stopped wearing the glove before making the second stroke, there would only have been one breach and the penalty would be loss of hole in match play or two strokes in stroke play. (New)

Other Decisions related to Rule 14-3: See “Artificial Devices, Unusual Equipment; Abnormal Use of Equipment” in the Index.

BALL AT REST MOVED BY PLAYER, PARTNER, CADDIE OR EQUIPMENT

18-2/0.5

Weight of Evidence Standard for Determining Whether Player Caused His Ball to Move

When a player's ball at rest moves, the cause of the ball's movement has to be assessed. In many situations, the answer will be obvious: the player may have kicked the ball inadvertently, dropped his equipment on it, or otherwise clearly caused it to move; alternatively, the player may have taken no action near the ball and something else (such as a spectator or animal) clearly caused it to move.

In other situations, however, there may be some question as to why the ball moved – e.g. because it is less than certain that the player's actions near the ball caused it to move, or because multiple factors were present that potentially might have caused the ball to move. All relevant information must be considered and the weight of the evidence must be evaluated (Decision 34-3/9). Depending on the circumstances, the relevant considerations may include, but are not limited to:

- The nature of any actions taken near the ball (e.g. movement of loose impediments, practice swings, grounding club, taking stance, etc.),
- Time elapsed between such actions and the movement of the ball,
- The lie of the ball before it moved (e.g. on a closely-mown area, perched on longer grass, on a surface imperfection, etc.),
- The conditions of the ground near the ball (e.g. degree of slope, presence of surface irregularities, etc.), and
- Wind, rain and other weather conditions.

If the weight of evidence indicates that it is more likely than not that the player caused the ball to move, even though that conclusion is not free from doubt, the player incurs a one-stroke penalty under Rule 18-2 and the ball must be replaced. Otherwise, the player incurs no penalty and the ball is played as it lies unless some other Rule applies (e.g. Rule 18-1).

With reference to the considerations above, examples of situations where the weight of the evidence would indicate that the player caused the ball to move are:

- A player's ball lies on a flat portion of the putting green on a day with light winds. The player addresses the ball and the ball immediately moves. Under these circumstances, it is more likely than not that the act of addressing the ball caused the ball to move.
- A player's ball lies on a tuft of grass in the rough. The player takes several practice swings near the ball, with the club coming into contact with grass in the process. Almost immediately, the ball then moves vertically down in the grass. Under these circumstances, it is more likely than not that the practice swings, in conjunction with the lie of the ball, caused the movement of the ball.

With reference to the considerations above, examples of situations where the weight of the evidence would indicate that the player did not cause the movement are:

- On a very windy day, a player addresses the ball on the putting green. A short time later the ball moves slightly in the direction the wind is blowing. The strength and direction of the wind and the delay in the movement of the ball after the club was grounded indicate that factors other than the player are more likely than not to have caused the movement.
- A player's ball lies on an upslope in a closely-mown area. He makes a practice swing, but does so some distance from the ball as he is concerned that the ball may move. He carefully takes his stance but does not ground his club. Prior to making his backswing for the stroke, the ball moves. As the ball did not move while the player made the practice swing or took his stance, it is more likely than not that other factors (i.e. the ball's lie on an upslope) caused the ball to move. (New)

20-7/4

Player Makes Multiple Strokes in Lateral Water Hazard Marked as Environmentally-Sensitive Area from Which Play Prohibited

Q. A player plays a ball into a lateral water hazard. He enters the hazard and makes a stroke at the ball, which moves only a few yards and remains in the hazard. He then makes another stroke at the ball and it comes to rest outside the hazard. His fellow-competitor then informs him that the lateral water hazard is marked as an environmentally-sensitive area (ESA), as permitted by Local Rule. What is the ruling?

A. As the player's ball had come to rest in a lateral water hazard defined as an ESA, he was not permitted to play the ball as it lay, but was required by the Local Rule to take relief under one of the options provided in the Lateral Water Hazard Rule (Rule 26-1).

In match play, the player lost the hole when he made his first stroke in the ESA.

In stroke play, the player incurred a two-stroke penalty for playing from a wrong place for each stroke made from the ESA for a total of four penalty strokes and was required to play out the hole with the ball played from the ESA, unless a serious breach has occurred. For a serious breach, see Rule 20-7c.

The same principles would apply to strokes made in other areas on the course from which play is prohibited (e.g. ground under repair from which relief is mandatory or a wrong putting green). (New)

Related Decision:

- [33-8/44 Significant Advantage Gained When Player Plays Stroke from Environmentally-Sensitive Area Defined as Water Hazard](#)

23-1/7.5

Loose Impediment Through the Green Moved When Ball Moved or in Process of Ball Being Lifted

Q. A loose impediment close to a player's ball lying through the green is moved when (a) the ball is moved in circumstances where a Rule requires the ball to be replaced, or (b) the ball is in the process of being lifted under a Rule that requires the ball to be replaced. The loose impediment was in such a position that it is likely that the player's ball would have moved if the loose impediment had been removed first. Should the player be required to replace the loose impediment prior to making his next stroke?

A. No, in such circumstances, the player is not required to replace the loose impediment. (New)

27-2a/5

Player Intends to Drop Provisional Ball After Search for Original Ball Has Commenced; Original Ball Found Within Five Minutes Before Dropped Ball Played

Q. A player searches for his ball for three minutes and then announces that he will return to play a provisional ball. The player drops the ball that he has announced as a provisional ball and then, prior to making a stroke with the provisional ball, the original ball is found within the five-minute search period. What is the ruling?

A. As the player had gone forward to search for his original ball, he was not entitled to play a provisional ball under Rule 27-2a. Consequently, as the procedure adopted by the player when dropping the ball was not in accordance with the Rules, he was entitled to correct his error under Rule 20-6 and continue play with the original ball, without penalty, from where it was found.

If the player did not correct his error under Rule 20-6 and made a stroke with the dropped ball, that ball became the ball in play under penalty of stroke-and-distance (see Rule 27-1a). (New)

Q. A and B are partners in a foursome competition. In view of the fact that only one of the partners in a foursome makes the first stroke from the 1st tee, how should Rule 6-3a (Time of Starting) and the requirement that players must be “present and ready to play” (see Decision 6-3a/2) be interpreted if A is making the first stroke from the 1st tee and B is not present at the 1st tee?

A. The requirement that players must be present and ready to play at the time established by the Committee does not mean that B must be present at the 1st tee. If B is not present at the 1st tee, he must be in a position where he would be ready to play the side’s next stroke from the area where the tee shot might be expected to finish.

If B is not present as described above then, despite the fact that the side has put a ball into play from the 1st tee, the side is in breach of Rule 6-3a. In such circumstances, the side is disqualified unless B is in position and ready to play within five minutes of the time of starting, in which case the penalty is loss of the first hole in match play or two strokes in stroke play (see penalty statement for Rule 6-3a).

If B is positioned in the area where he expects to be making the second stroke, but his prediction is inaccurate, resulting in him having to walk a considerable distance to the ball, there is no breach of Rule 6-3a.

In foursomes match play, a side cannot avoid a penalty under Rule 6-3a by conceding holes until the partner who has not been present arrives. (New)

Other Decisions related to Rule 29: See “Foursomes” in the Index.

31-6/1**Incorrect Score on Hole Returned in Four-Ball Stroke Play Discovered Prior to Close of Competition**

In four-ball stroke play, A and B are partners and return a score card with an incorrect score on the 12th hole and the error is discovered before the close of competition. The following scenarios illustrate how Rules 6-6d, 31-6 and 31-7a are to be applied:

1. A returned a score of 4 and B returned a score of 5. A actually took 5 or more strokes on the hole or failed to hole out. As A's recorded score was lower than actually taken, the side is disqualified under Rule 31-7a.
2. A returned a score of 4 and B returned a score of 5. A incurred a penalty for grounding his club in a hazard before playing his ball from the hazard and was aware of the breach before returning the score card, but failed to include it in his score for the hole. The Exception to Rule 6-6d does not apply and the side is disqualified under Rule 31-7a.
3. A returned a score of 4 and B returned a score of 5. A incurred a penalty for grounding his club in a hazard before playing his ball from the hazard but was unaware of the breach before returning the score card. The Exception to Rule 6-6d applies. As A's score was the score to count on the hole, the Committee must apply the two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 13-4 to A's score on that hole and, as provided in the Exception to Rule 6-6d, the additional two-stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 6-6d is also applied to A's score for that hole. Therefore, the side's score for the hole is 8. The Rules do not allow the side to revert to B's score after the score card has been returned.
4. A and B returned scores of 4. A incurred a penalty for grounding his club in a hazard before playing his ball from the hazard. As B also scored a 4 on the hole, A's failure to include the penalty in his score does not affect the result of the side's score. Accordingly, no penalty is applicable (see Decision 31-7a/1). The side's score for the hole is 4. (New)

Decisions Related to Rule 31-6:

- 4-4a/10 Breach of 14-Club Rule in Stroke Play Discovered at 8th Hole; Where Penalty Strokes Applied.
- 30-3/2 Effect of State of Match Penalties in Four-Ball Play.

31-7a/3

Omission of Penalty on Returned Score Card Discovered Before Close of Competition; Only Partner Aware of Penalty

Q. A and B are partners in a four-ball stroke play competition. On the 11th hole, A accidentally moved his ball in play in breach of Rule 18-2. A replaced the ball and completed the hole, but did not know that he had incurred a penalty. B witnessed the incident and knew it was a one-stroke penalty. B scored 6 on the hole and, with the one-stroke penalty included, A scored 5. The score card was returned and on the 11th hole there was a 4 for A and a 6 for B. As A did not know he had incurred a penalty, does the Exception to Rule 6-6d apply?

A. No, in four-ball stroke play, the word “competitor” includes his partner, where the context so admits – see Definition of “Competitor.” Accordingly, the side is disqualified under Rule 31-7a. (New)

32-1b/1

Incorrect Score on Hole Returned in Stableford Competition Discovered Prior to Close of Competition

Q. In a Stableford competition against a fixed score of par, A returns a score of 4 on the par-4 6th hole. However, before the close of competition, it is discovered that A had failed to include a two-stroke penalty in his score on the 6th hole for a breach that he did not know he had incurred. What is the ruling?

A. The Exception to Rule 6-6d applies because the competitor did not know, before returning his score card, that he had incurred the penalty on the 6th hole. The Committee must add the two-stroke penalty to his score for the 6th hole, and the points on the hole must be adjusted. In addition, as provided in Note 3 to Rule 32-1b, the Committee must deduct an additional two points from his total points scored for the round.

If A had returned a score of 6 on the 6th hole without including the two-stroke penalty, no penalty would be applied because the breach of Rule 6-6d did not affect the result of the hole (see Note 3 to Rule 32-1b). (New)

33/2

Player Withdraws from Match Play Competition

Q. In match play, player A withdraws from the competition prior to the commencement of his next match. What is the proper procedure with respect to the draw if the Committee has not specified a relevant procedure in the conditions of the competition?

A. The Committee must proceed in accordance with equity (Rule 1-4). Depending on the circumstances, the Committee's options include:

1. Declare A's next opponent the winner of the match by default; or
2. If A withdraws before his first match:
 - a. If time permits, produce a new match play draw; or
 - b. Replace A with a player from the reserve list; or
 - c. Where players have qualified through stroke play for the match play competition, replace A with the player who is now judged to be the final qualifier; or
3. If A withdraws after his first or subsequent match, require all players eliminated by A in match play to play off for his position. (New)

33-8/32

Local Rule for Animal Hoof Damage

Q. A Committee may, by Local Rule, declare damage that is clearly identifiable as having been caused by animal hoofs to be ground under repair. However, if there is a strong possibility that animals may cause hoof damage to putting greens, and the extent of the damage could make it impracticable to take relief under Rule 25-1b(iii), what may the Committee do?

A. Rather than treating such damage to the putting green as ground under repair, the Committee may make a Local Rule permitting the repair of such damage on the putting green.

The following Local Rule would be recommended in such circumstances:

“Other than on the putting green, damage that is clearly identifiable as having been caused by animal hoofs is ground under repair (Rule 25-1 applies).”

Such damage on the putting green may be repaired (Rule 25-1 does not apply).” (New)

33-8/32.7

Local Rule Providing Relief from Excessive Bird or Animal Dung

Q. Bird or animal dung is a loose impediment, but if a course suffers from an excess of dung that is difficult to remove and interferes with the proper playing of the game, may a Committee make a Local Rule providing relief from the excessive dung?

A. Yes. The Committee may declare dung that is prevalent on the course to be ground under repair and provide relief under Rule 25-1b.

In addition, if treating the dung as ground under repair and taking relief under Rule 25-1b(iii) when a ball lies on the putting green is unlikely to provide complete relief, the Committee may authorize players to use equipment, such as a greens switch/whip, to remove the dung from the line of putt without any penalty applying under Rule 16-1a for incidentally pressing something down in the process of the removal. (New)

33-8/36.5

Local Rule for Concrete Drainage Channels

Q. On courses that are prone to flooding it is often necessary to construct narrow concrete drainage channels. By Definition, such drainage channels are water hazards. However, these channels frequently run adjacent and parallel to cart paths and are more like immovable obstructions than water hazards. Does a Committee have an alternative to treating such drainage channels as water hazards?

A. Yes. A Committee may introduce the following Local Rule:

“Drainage channels constructed with artificial materials and which run adjacent and parallel to cart paths are deemed to be part of the cart path (i.e. they are treated as one immovable obstruction) and Rule 24-2b(i) applies.” (New)